

THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. LVIII.—OCTOBER, 1883.

MONTANISM AND ITS MODERN REPRESENTATIVES.

MONTANISM was one of those eccentric forms of Christianity which have appeared from time to time in the history of the Christian Church. It combined all the ascetic, rigoristic, and chiliastic elements of the ante-Nicene age. In Montanism these asserted a claim to universal validity, which the Catholic Church felt compelled, for her own interest, to reject, leaving the effort after extraordinary holiness to a comparatively small circle of ascetics and priests, and seeking rather to lighten Christianity for the great mass of its professors than add to its weight. Montanism was not originally a departure from the faith, but a morbid overstraining of the practical morality and discipline of the early Church. It was an excessive supernaturalism and puritanism in opposition to Gnostic rationalism and Catholic laxity. It is the first example of an earnest and well-meaning, but gloomy and fanatical hyper-Christianity, which, like all hyper-spiritualism, is apt to end in the flesh.

Montanism originated in Asia Minor, the theatre of many movements of the Church in this period; yet not in Ephesus or any large city, but in some insignificant villages of the province of Phrygia, once the home of a sensuously mystic and dreamy nature-religion, where Paul and his pupils had planted congregations at Colossæ and Hierapolis. The movement was started about the middle of the second century, during the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius, by a certain Montanus. According to hostile accounts, before his conversion he was a mutilated priest of Cybele, with no special talents or culture, but burning with fanatical zeal. He fell into somnambulistic ecstasies, and considered himself the inspired organ of the promised Paraclete or Advocate, the Helper and Comforter in these last times of distress. His adversaries wrongly inferred, from the use of the first person for the Holy Spirit in his oracles, that he made himself directly the Paraclete, or, according to Epiphanius, even God the Father. Connected with him were two prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, who left their

VOL. X.—NO. LVIII.

R

husbands. During the bloody persecutions under the Antonines, which raged in Asia Minor, and caused the death of Polycarp (155), the three went forth as prophets and reformers of the Christian life, and proclaimed the near approach of the age of the Holy Spirit and of the millennial reign, in Pepuza, a small village of Phrygia, upon which the new Jerusalem was to come down. Scenes took place similar to those under the preaching of the first Quakers, and glossolalia and prophesying in the Irvingite congregations. The frantic movement soon far exceeded the intention of its authors, spread to Rome and North Africa, and threw the whole Church into commotion. It gave rise to the first Synods which are mentioned after the apostolic age.

The followers of Montanus were called Montanists, also Phrygians, Cataphrygians (from the province of their origin), Pepuziani, Priscillianists (from Priscilla, not to be confounded with the Priscillianists of the fourth century). They called themselves *spiritual* Christians (πνευματικοί), in distinction from the psychic or carnal Christians (ψυχικοί).

The bishops and Synods of Asia Minor, though not with one voice, declared the new prophecy the work of demons, applied exorcism, and cut off the Montanists from the fellowship of the Church. All agreed that it was supernatural (a natural interpretation of such psychological phenomena being then unknown), and the only alternative was to ascribe it either to God or to His great Adversary. Prejudice and malice invented against Montanus and the two female prophets slanderous charges of immorality, madness, and suicide, which were readily believed. Epiphanius and John of Damascus tell the absurd story, that the sacrifice of an infant was a part of the mystic worship of the Montanists, and that they made bread with the blood of murdered infants.

Among their literary opponents in the East are mentioned Claudius Appollinarius of Hierapolis, Miltiades, Appollonius, Serapion of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria.

The Roman Church, during the episcopate of Eleutherus (177-190), or of Victor (190-202), after some vacillation, set itself likewise against the new prophets at the instigation of the presbyter Caius and the confessor Praxeas from Asia, who, as Tertullian sarcastically says, did a two-fold service to the devil at Rome by driving away prophecy and bringing in heresy (Patripassianism); or by putting to flight the Holy Spirit and crucifying God the Father. Yet the opposition of Hippolytus to Zephyrinus and Callistus, as well as the later Novatian schism, show that the disciplinary rigorism of Montanism found energetic advocates in Rome till after the middle of the third century.

The Gallic Christians, then severely tried by persecution, took a conciliatory posture, and sympathised at least with the moral earnestness, the enthusiasm for martyrdom, and the chiliastic hopes of the Montanists. They sent their presbyter (afterwards bishop) Trenæus to Eleutherus in Rome to intercede in their behalf. This mission seems

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

to have induced him or his successor to issue letters of peace, but they were soon afterwards recalled. This sealed the fate of the party.

In North Africa the Montanists met with extensive sympathy, as the Punic national character leans naturally towards gloomy and rigorous acerbity. Two of the most distinguished female martyrs, Perpetua and Felicitas, were addicted to them, and died a heroic death at Carthage, in the persecution of Septimius Severus (203).

Their greatest conquest was the gifted and fiery, but eccentric and rigoristic Tertullian. He became, in the year 201 or 202, from ascetic sympathies, a most energetic and influential advocate of Montanism, and helped its dark feeling towards a twilight of philosophy, without, however, formally receding from the Catholic Church, whose doctrines he continued to defend against the heretics. At all events, he was not excommunicated, and his orthodox writings were always highly esteemed. He is the only theologian of this schismatic movement, which started in purely practical questions; and we derive the best of our knowledge of it from his works. Through him, too, its principles reacted in many respects on the Catholic Church; and that not only in North Africa, but also in Spain, as we may see from the harsh decrees of the Council of Elvira in 306. It is singular that Cyprian, who, with all his High Church tendencies and abhorrence of schism, was a daily reader of Tertullian, makes no allusion to Montanism. Augustine relates that Tertullian left the Montanists, and founded a new sect, which was, through his (Augustine's) agency, reconciled to the Catholic congregation of Carthage.

As a separate sect, the Montanist or Tertullianists, as they were also called in Africa, run down into the sixth century. At the time of Epiphanius, the sect had many adherents in Phrygia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and in Constantinople. The successors of Constantine, down to Justinian (530), repeatedly enacted laws against them. Synodical legislation about the validity of Montanist baptism is inconsistent.

Passing on to analyse the character and tenets of Montanism, we note:—

I. Its *Doctrine*. Montanism agreed in all essential points with the Catholic Church, and held very firmly to the traditional rule of faith. Tertullian was thoroughly orthodox, according to the standard of his age. It is true, he opposed infant baptism, on the assumption that mortal sins could not be forgiven after baptism; but infant baptism was not yet a catholic dogma, and was left to the discretion of parents. He contributed to the development of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, by asserting against Patricianism a personal distinction in God, and the import of the Holy Spirit. Montanism was rooted neither, like Ebionism, in Judaism, nor, like Gnosticism, in heathenism, but in Christianity; and its errors consist in a morbid exaggeration of Christian ideas and demands. Tertullian says, that the administration of the Paraclete consists only in the reform of dis-

cipline, in deeper understanding of the Scriptures, and in effort after higher perfection; that it has the same faith, the same God, the same Christ, and the same sacraments with the Catholics. The sect combated the Gnostic heresy with all decision, of which system it forms the exact counterpart, placing Christianity chiefly in practical life instead of theoretical speculation, and looking for the consummation of the kingdom of God on this earth, though not till the millennium, instead of transferring it into an abstract ideal world. Yet, between these two systems, as always between opposite extremes, there were also points of contact: a common antagonism, for example, to the present order of the world, and the distinction of a pneumatic and a psychical Church.

Tertullian conceived religion as a process of development, which he illustrates by the analogy of organic growth in nature. He distinguishes in this process four stages:—(1) Natural religion, or the innate idea of God; (2) the legal religion of the Old Testament; (3) the Gospel during the earthly life of Christ; and (4) the revelation of the Paraclete; that is, the spiritual religion of the Montanists, who accordingly called themselves the *pneumatics*, or spiritual Church, in distinction from the psychical (or *carnal*) Catholic Church. This is the first instance of a theory of development which assumes an advance beyond the New Testament and the Christianity of the apostles; misapplying the parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven, and Paul's doctrine of the growth of the Church *in* Christ (but not *beyond* Christ). Tertullian, however, was by no means rationalistic in his view. On the contrary, he demanded for all new revelations the closest agreement with the traditional faith of the Church, the *regula fidei* which, in a genuine Montanistic work, he terms "*immobilis et irreformabilis*." Nevertheless, he gave the revelations of the Phrygian prophets on matters of practice an importance which interfered with the sufficiency of the Scriptures.

II. In the region of *Practical Life and Discipline*, the Montanistic movement and its expectation of the near approach of the end of the world came into conflict with the reigning Catholicism; and this conflict, consistently carried out, could not but show itself to some extent in the province of doctrine. Every schismatic tendency is apt to become in its progress more or less heretical.

1. Montanism, in the first place, sought a forced continuance of the *miraculous gifts* of the Apostolic Church, which gradually disappeared as Christianity became settled in humanity, and its supernatural principle was naturalised on earth. It asserted, above all, the continuance of *prophecy*; and hence it went generally under the name of the *nova prophetia*. It appealed to Scriptural examples—John, Agabus, Judas, and Silas; and for their female prophets, to Miriam and Deborah, and especially to the four daughters of Philip, who were buried in Hierapolis, the capital of Phrygia. Ecstatic oracular utterances were

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

mistaken for Divine inspirations. Tertullian calls the mental status of these prophets an "*amentia*," an "*excidere sensu*," and describes it in a way which irresistibly reminds one of the phenomena of magnetic clairvoyance. Montanus compares a man in the ecstasy to a musical instrument, on which the Holy Spirit plays His melodies. "Behold," says he in one of his oracles, "in the name of the Paraclete, the man is a lyre, and I sweep over him as a plectrum. The man sleeps; I wake. Behold, it is the Lord who puts the hearts of men out of themselves, and who gives hearts to men." As to its matter, the Montanistic prophecy related to the approaching heavy judgments of God, the persecutions, the millennium, fasting, and other ascetic exercises, which were to be enforced as laws of the Church.

The Catholic Church did not deny, in theory, the continuance of prophecy and the other miraculous gifts, but was disposed to derive the Montanistic revelations from Satanic inspirations, and mistrusted them all the more for their proceeding not from the regular clergy, but in great part from unauthorised laymen and fanatical women.

2. This brings us to another feature of the Montanistic movement—the assertion of the *universal priesthood* of Christians, even of females, against the clerical aristocracy, which from the time of Ignatius had more and more monopolised all ministerial privileges and functions. The Montanists found the true qualification and appointment for the office of teacher in direct endowment by the Spirit of God, in distinction from outward ordination and episcopal succession. They everywhere proposed the supernatural element and the free motion of the Spirit against the mechanism of a fixed ecclesiastical order.

Here was the point where they necessarily assumed a schismatic character, and arrayed against themselves the episcopal hierarchy. But they only brought another kind of aristocracy into the place of the condemned distinction of clergy and laity. They claimed for their prophets what they denied to the Catholic bishops. They put a great gulf between the true spiritual Christians and the merely psychical; and this induced spiritual pride and false pietism. Their affinity with the Protestant idea of the universal priesthood is more apparent than real; they go on altogether different principles.

3. Another of the essential and prominent traits of Montanism was a visionary *Millenarianism*, founded indeed on the Apocalypse and on the apostolic expectation of the speedy return of Christ, but giving extravagant weight and a materialistic colouring. The Montanists were the warmest millenarians in the ancient Church, and held fast to the speedy return of Christ in glory, all the more as this hope began to give way to the feeling of a long settlement of the Church on earth, and to a corresponding zeal for a compact, solid episcopal organisation. In praying, "Thy kingdom come," they prayed for the end of the world. They lived under a vivid impression of the great final catastrophe, and looked therefore with contempt upon the present order

of things, and directed all their desires to the second advent of Christ. Maxmilla says: "After me there is no more prophecy, but only the end of the world."

The failure of these predictions weakened, of course, all the other pretensions of the system. But, on the other hand, the abatement of faith in the near approach of the Lord was certainly accompanied in the Catholic Church with an increase of worldliness. The millenarianism of the Montanists has reappeared again and again in widely differing forms.

4. Finally, the Montanistic sect was characterised by fanatical severity in *Asceticism* and *Church Discipline*. It raised a zealous protest against the growing looseness of the Catholic penitential discipline, which in Rome particularly, under Zephyrinus and Callistus, to the great grief of earnest minds, established a scheme of indulgence for the grossest sins, and began, long before Constantine, to obscure the line between the Church and the world. Tertullian makes the restoration of a rigorous discipline the chief office of the new prophecy.

But Montanism certainly went to the opposite extreme, and fell from evangelical freedom into Jewish legalism; while the Catholic Church in rejecting the new laws and burdens defended the cause of freedom. Montanism turned with horror from all the enjoyments of life, and held even art to be incompatible with Christian soberness and humility. It forbade women all ornamental clothing, and required virgins to be veiled. It courted the blood-baptism of martyrdom, and condemned concealment or flight in persecution as a denial of Christ. It multiplied fasts and other ascetic exercises, and carried them to the extreme severity, as the best preparation for the millennium. It prohibited second marriage as adultery, for laity as well as clergy, and inclined even to regard a single marriage as a mere concession on the part of God to the sensuous infirmity of man. It taught the impossibility of a second repentance, and refused to restore the lapsed to the fellowship of the Church. Tertullian held all mortal sins (of which he numbers seven), if committed after baptism, to be unpardonable, at least in this world; and a Church which showed such lenity towards gross offenders as the Roman Church at that time did, according to the corroborating testimony of Hippolytus, he called worse than a "den of thieves," even a "*spelunca mæchorum et fornicatorum*."

The Catholic Church, indeed, opened the door likewise to excessive ascetic rigor, but only as an exception to her rule; while the Montanists pressed their rigoristic demands as binding upon all. Such universal asceticism was simply impracticable in a world like the present, and the sect itself necessarily dwindled away. But the religious earnestness which animated it, its prophecies and visions, its millenarianism, and the fanatical extremes into which it ran, have since reappeared, under various names and forms, and in new combinations, — in Novatianism, Donatism, the spiritualism of the Franciscans, Ana-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

baptism, the Camisard enthusiasm, Puritanism, Quakerism, Quietism, Pietism, Second Adventism, Irvingism, and so on, by way of protest and wholesome reaction against various evils in the Church.

Renan compares Montanism with Mormonism. But this is most unjust to Montanism, which was a thoroughly honest and earnest movement, free from polygamy and all worldly aims. A far better and more worthy parallel is furnished by Irvingism. Both are thoroughly orthodox in all the articles of œcumenical faith; both excel in strict discipline; both agree in claiming and exercising the spiritual gifts of the apostolic age; both proclaim the near approach of the advent of Christ; both are solemn warnings against the corruptions and dangers of the ruling Church. But Montanism was democratic, and asserted the general priesthood of the laity, including women; while Irvingism is a thoroughly aristocratic organisation, with a complete hierarchy of apostles, prophets, evangelists, angels, bishops, priests, and deacons, and has a high liturgical and ritualistic form of worship. Both start from historic pessimism, and pass away like shining meteors, while the historic Church, notwithstanding all corruptions and obstructions, is marching on with the promise that the gates of Hades shall never prevail against it. Irvingism still lives, but its prophetic voices are silent; the speaking in tongues has ceased, its apostles are nearly all dead, and their places remain vacant. And as to the Second Advent, it is steadily approaching indeed, but "the times and the seasons" the Father concealed even from His own Son in the days of His humiliation, and "has put in His own power."

PHILIP SCHAFF.

OUR LORD'S METHOD OF DEALING WITH DIFFERENT CLASSES.

THE point which we are to discuss here, in connection with our Lord's ministry is one of great practical importance. For the great object of the Christian ministry is to deal with all classes of men, in order to bring them into the kingdom of God, and to transform their character once they are there. Our labour is vain if we fail to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, and to carry them on from stage to stage in the life of faith and holiness. How did our blessed Master go about this work? Did He use the same method with all sorts and conditions of men? If not, how and on what principles did He vary His method? These questions will afford us materials for very interesting and profitable practical study.

The first and most memorable thing to be noted in connection with

our Lord's pastoral dealings with different classes is His habit of ranking His hearers in two great divisions, between whom there was a most vital difference. Many instances of this will occur to every one familiar with the Gospels. It is quite natural that Matthew, who of all the Evangelists had the keenest eye for contrasts, should record the greatest number of them. It is remarkable, too, that, before noting this feature in our Lord's ministry, he should have noted it in John the Baptist's, or rather should have recorded John's forecast of the searching nature of the ministry of Jesus: "whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather the wheat into His garner; but the chaff He will burn up with unquenchable fire." Accordingly, in the Sermon on the Mount we have the two great classes of hearers significantly represented by the two *gates*, the two *ways*, and the two *endings*—life and destruction. The same division is made in the summing up of the discourse, where the hearers are either like the wise builder that built on the rock, or the foolish that built on the sand. So of the ten virgins, five are wise and five are foolish; and the difference is anything but trivial; the wise are admitted into the palace; the foolish are irretrievably shut out. The parable of the talents, though less formally, recognises the same division—some improve their talents and are rewarded; others wickedly and slothfully neglect them, and are punished. So, likewise, in the parable of the sower: part of the seed, through various causes, is lost; part of it bears fruit in varying degrees. But of all forms in which Christ taught this great truth, the most solemn and impressive is the parable of the sheep and the goats. The great assembly here divided into two is not limited to those that heard Christ personally, but embraces "all nations." It is not easy to determine the precise application of this parable; but the division of the whole into two parts is as complete as when a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats. The criterion of judgment is remarkable—the presence or the absence of practical sympathy towards the brethren of Christ in their times of distress. The final issue is described in terms of simple but awful distinctness: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

It cannot be disputed that, as our Lord looked over the people that listened to His discourses, there was ever before His mind this notion of the two-fold division, and the final two-fold destiny. It was a most solemn and impressive thought, and doubtless it had a great influence in quickening His ardour and intensifying His appeals. Yet naturally it is a thought far from pleasant either to the people or to the preacher. That there should be only two paths from this world to eternity, and that the one should issue in life and the other in destruction, is a truth anything but welcome to the human mind. Human nature, in such a case, makes a desperate effort to find a *tertium quid*. Many who have no reason to believe that they have entered in at the strait gate cannot bring themselves to think that they are walking on the road to destruc-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

tion. They would fain find a third path, not quite so narrow as the one, and not quite so broad as the other, and leading up, not to absolute life or absolute destruction, but to something between. It is this desperate reluctance of men to accept our Lord's alternative that makes purgatory so attractive in the Church of Rome. The idea that our state for ever and ever is to be finally determined by our conduct in this short life and in this feeble condition of being, is very unpopular, and men are ready to grasp a straw in the hope of extending the probation. Liberal theology sets aside this outstanding feature of our Lord's teaching, makes all characters to shade off, by minute touches, into one another, and finds accommodation for all, sooner or later, in the house of many mansions. But what right have we to set aside in this manner the great lesson of our Master? If we make so much as a pretence to fidelity, must we not teach precisely as He taught, especially in a matter of such vital importance?

Yet nothing could be more miserable than to follow Him here in the letter, as some do, without following Him in the spirit. Men that have heaven and hell for ever on their lips are not always men whose hearts tremble at the awfulness of the difference. Preachers who realise profoundly that every member of their audience is travelling to the one place or to the other, will not be glib and easy in their references to them; the effect of their profound conviction will come out in the intense reality and earnestness both of their preaching and their prayers, and in the directness and fervour of their appeals to their hearers at once to accept the offers made so graciously to them in the Gospel.

Proceeding, then, on this great division of the two classes of hearers, let us go on to point out the differences in our Lord's method of dealing with the various kinds of men and women that lay on either side the line. In this paper we confine ourselves to His dealings with those outside the kingdom; and here the most important difference which we find is His treatment of openly lost sinners on the one hand, and of respectable but self-righteous, and therefore non-justified, persons on the other.

I. His treatment of the openly lost was one of the most striking features of His whole ministry. It brought on Him the scorn of those who were incapable of understanding a noble deed. He was nicknamed "the friend of publicans and sinners." It was uttered against Him as a reproach—"this man receiveth sinners." It was even believed by one that was friendly to Him, Simon the leper, that had He been a prophet He would have disdained the homage of the woman that was a sinner. Such persons could not appreciate the spirit that longs to save the lost, nor see that a nature so pure as Christ's stood in no more danger of defilement from personal contact with the guiltiest of the race, than does the sunbeam that falls on the dunghill.

The cases in which Jesus showed kindly consideration for persons

steeped in guilt were—some real, and one imaginary. Of the former was the case of the woman of Samaria; that of the woman taken in adultery; that of the woman that was a sinner; and that of the thief on the cross. The imaginary case was that of the prodigal son. It is to be observed of these cases that the persons concerned were not all roaming and rioting in the pleasures of sin; most of them had been brought to bay either by the law of the country, or by circumstances of their position, so that in a sense they were subdued. In all of them our Lord seems to have apprehended a similar state of feeling; a hopelessness of regaining their lost character and earthly position, far less the favour of God, *through any power inherent in themselves, or in those who were around them*; as far as any resources of their own were concerned, they were consciously lost. If anything was to be made of such persons, it must be by leading them *to look away from themselves*, and giving them an impressive sight of God's blessed provision for saving the lost. Sometimes our Lord formally unfolded the provision of grace; but more frequently he conveyed the sense of it in a less formal way. To the woman of Samaria he said, "*If thou knewest the gift of God*, and who it is that saith to thee, give me to drink, thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." Here was a direct proclamation of God's saving grace; but usually it was made known less directly. The truth is, the whole of Christ's earthly career, and especially his miracles of healing, were exhibitions of the grace of God. If you ask, Why did not our Lord *preach* grace more? Why did He not deliver more addresses corresponding to the evangelistic addresses of to-day? the answer is, He *lived* grace. His whole life was a sermon of grace. The tenderness of His spirit, the readiness of His sympathy, the cordiality of His manner, the frankness and freeness of His cures, the fervour of His invitations, the heavenliness of His life were all exhibitions of Divine grace, and were thus the means of rekindling hope where its lamp had long been extinguished, and where nothing remained but the blackness of despair. The very sight of Christ, the interest which He took in the fallen, the very looks He cast on them, appear in some instances to have kindled a new sense of heavenly goodness, and a new faith in the possibility of restoration to pardon and to purity, where the dire experience of lust raging within, and the cold frown of the respectable world without, had quenched all faith in both.

Some of these lost sinners seem first to have been drawn to Christ by a spirit of vague, wistful wonder, with something of the feeling of the woman who said, "If I may but touch the hem of His garment I shall be made whole." What made the woman that was a sinner wash Christ's feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hairs of her head? She had not been forgiven at the time; but having seen and heard Christ, having perhaps heard some of His parables of grace, she appears to have felt the beating of a long-lost hope in her bosom—felt that so gracious a Being was able and probably willing to raise even her up

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

from the horrible pit and the miry clay, to fulfil to her the promise in Hosea, giving her the valley of Achor for a door of hope, and making her—poor *blasée* creature though she was—to sing as in the days of her youth. When such as she entered into communication with Christ, belief in heavenly grace had already begun to dawn, but vaguely and dimly; what they needed was confirmation of their flickering trust, a solid foundation for hope and peace. It was this He gave to the woman that was a sinner—"Be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" and to the thief on the cross—"Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise." The glimpse of grace that they had got when yet afar off, and which they had cherished so lovingly, was changed into a nearer and more satisfying view. Their cry from the depths was answered by the assurance of plenteous redemption; and with the pulse of a new life beating in their veins, and the hope of glory brightening their future, they lifted up their heads, and went on their way rejoicing.

The pastoral lesson that comes to us from this, for dealing with the lowest samples of humanity, when subdued and brought to bay by the evil tenor of their lives, is obvious. On a similar stage, a similar experience, a similar despair of getting out of the mire of sin, has been felt. Probably there was a reason why so many of these cases, recorded in the Gospels, were cases of abandoned women. For when a woman loses herself in sensual vice or other gross criminality, the ruin is more thorough, and the hope of recovery is much less than in the case of men. The devil can make shorter work with the weaker sex. Christian ladies, who in visiting prisons and penitentiaries have become intimately acquainted with criminal women, have often remarked in them a peculiarly hard, reckless, hopeless state of mind. To awaken in them any longing for a better life, or any belief in its reality, or in the possibility of attaining it, has often been most difficult. But it has been strongly felt that the first step towards recovery must be to inspire them with faith in the reality and possibility of recovery and of a better life. And it has been very interesting to observe cases in which the very beauty and purity of the visitor's own spirit, her unwearied love and patience in seeking the poor prisoner's good, was the first step towards that prisoner's reformation. It broke up the hard crust of scepticism; it broke down the hard rebellious spirit that refused to believe in the existence of goodness; it dissipated the gloomy suspicion that had persisted in ascribing even the labour of love to some unknown form of self-seeking. And the dawn of faith in the reality of human sympathy proved a blessed stepping-stone to faith in the goodness and sympathy of the Divine Redeemer. For the goodness of the lady visitor was but a drop derived from the great ocean, a reflected ray of the great Sun of Righteousness. It was easier after this to lead the thoughts to the fountain for sin and uncleanness opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The life of Jesus came to have a reality unknown before,

and the doctrine of redemption through his blood began to be viewed with the eagerness of a personal interest. Wherever our aim is to inspire faith in the reality of the Divine goodness, nothing is more important than that our own spirit and our own bearing should be steps towards the great conclusion. And wherever men and women seem hopelessly sunk in sin, the first great step towards their recovery is when they see that in no sense is it from within,—it is wholly from without, from the goodness and grace of God revealed in Christ, that their deliverance must come.

II. Very different was our Lord's treatment of the self-righteous. While to the consciously lost and hopeless he brought near the grace of a forgiving God,—to the consciously righteous he applied the test of a holy law. But we must discriminate between two classes embraced in the term self-righteous; for it included hypocrites, living in sin, but observant of all the ceremonies of religion; as well as a class of sincere respectable men, who thought that on the whole they fulfilled all that was required by the law.

In reference to the former, the perverted Pharisees, whose notion of righteousness was limited to ceremonial observances, and who outraged the law in its weightier obligations, the attitude of our Lord was that of stern rebuke and indignant denunciation. We often feel surprise at the tremendous severity of the tone in which he inveighed against them. We must remember his remarkable insight into the human heart—a circumstance which makes his example applicable to us in but a limited degree. Still, the impression remains on our minds that there must be cases in which, even for us, the proper mode of dealing with sin is that of stern and crushing rebuke. There are cases in medicine where the true treatment is to administer a shock, and there are similar cases in spiritual disease. It is evident that religious hypocrisy was surpassingly odious to Christ. For men to imagine that God could find satisfaction in a round of ceremonies, while judgment, mercy, and truth were trampled on, was a fearful insult to the God of holiness. Such a spirit implied a terrible moral levity—the levity that could degrade the holiest things of God, and trample them under the feet of men. In such a state of mind our Lord could discover no ground for that Faith whose very nature it is to look up to the High and Holy One to whom it owes all reverence and submission. To speak of the love and grace of God to such would only have been to cast pearls before swine; and the only way to do them real good was to shell them, as it were, out of their position; to hurl woe upon woe against them, if perchance they might be terrified into the belief of a righteous Judge, and, seeing their condition, begin to ask, What must we do to be saved?

It was in this way that our Lord taught His ministers most emphatically, that though they were to be ministers of grace and reconciliation, yet the reproof of sin would ever be a most essential, though a very

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

difficult part of their office. "Every part of the duty of a minister," says a distinguished writer, "is more easy than to maintain in vigour the spirit he needs as the reprover of sin and the guardian of virtue."* Our Lord left men in no doubt what He thought of sin. The denunciations of it which he uttered were really what cost Him His life. And when Peter followed Him on the day of Pentecost and other days, He was equally explicit. He arraigned His hearers as murderers of the Prince of Life. He made no mystery of what they deserved. And then, when their anxious faces and cries of distraction showed that His words had told—that they were subdued and brought to bay, He brought out for them, as it were, that grace of God which is so rich and free to every penitent, and He promised them all the blessings of redemption, through the blood of the very Man whom they had crucified and slain.

The other class of self-righteous persons with whom our Lord dealt were respectable men, without hypocrisy, but who had a higher opinion of themselves than they ought to have had. The young ruler who believed that from his youth he had kept all the commandments was one of these. So also were some to whom the first part of the Sermon on the Mount was addressed—persons who did not know that "unless their righteousness exceeded that of the Scribes and Pharisees, they would in no wise enter into the kingdom of God." In dealing with such persons, Christ's method was to show the searching nature of the Divine law, and for this end He showed them that the law imposed a test which human nature could not endure. He showed that the Word of God was quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, dividing even between the joints and marrow, and that it was a discernor of the hearts of men. A lascivious lust is adultery; a savage feeling is murder. This is the way to deal with respectable formalism. The spirituality of God's nature and the corresponding spirituality of His law, show how hopeless it is to expect salvation by works. He that sets our iniquities before Him, our secret sins in the light of His countenance; He that desires truth in the inward parts, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and who cannot look upon sin, has a far higher standard of judgment than most suppose. The law by its very nature is law; it knows no relaxation and no indulgence; if once its condemnation falls upon you, "Thou shalt in no wise come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

III. A third class of persons outside the kingdom with whom our Lord had often to deal were cavillers,—persons who sneered in their hearts at His doctrine, and tried to trip Him up before the people. It was one of the most memorable features of His ministry that He was always so ready for this class, and that He so uniformly succeeded in turning their position and in making their very cavils the occasion of utter defeat. This shows the thoroughness of His composure, and the

* "Saturday Night," by Isaac Taylor, p. 183.

and the doctrine of redemption through his blood began to be viewed with the eagerness of a personal interest. Wherever our aim is to inspire faith in the reality of the Divine goodness, nothing is more important than that our own spirit and our own bearing should be steps towards the great conclusion. And wherever men and women seem hopelessly sunk in sin, the first great step towards their recovery is when they see that in no sense is it from within,—it is wholly from without, from the goodness and grace of God revealed in Christ, that their deliverance must come.

II. Very different was our Lord's treatment of the self-righteous. While to the consciously lost and hopeless he brought near the grace of a forgiving God,—to the consciously righteous he applied the test of a holy law. But we must discriminate between two classes embraced in the term self-righteous; for it included hypocrites, living in sin, but observant of all the ceremonies of religion; as well as a class of sincere respectable men, who thought that on the whole they fulfilled all that was required by the law.

In reference to the former, the perverted Pharisees, whose notion of righteousness was limited to ceremonial observances, and who outraged the law in its weightier obligations, the attitude of our Lord was that of stern rebuke and indignant denunciation. We often feel surprise at the tremendous severity of the tone in which he inveighed against them. We must remember his remarkable insight into the human heart—a circumstance which makes his example applicable to us in but a limited degree. Still, the impression remains on our minds that there must be cases in which, even for us, the proper mode of dealing with sin is that of stern and crushing rebuke. There are cases in medicine where the true treatment is to administer a shock, and there are similar cases in spiritual disease. It is evident that religious hypocrisy was surpassingly odious to Christ. For men to imagine that God could find satisfaction in a round of ceremonies, while judgment, mercy, and truth were trampled on, was a fearful insult to the God of holiness. Such a spirit implied a terrible moral levity—the levity that could degrade the holiest things of God, and trample them under the feet of men. In such a state of mind our Lord could discover no ground for that Faith whose very nature it is to look up to the High and Holy One to whom it owes all reverence and submission. To speak of the love and grace of God to such would only have been to cast pearls before swine; and the only way to do them real good was to shell them, as it were, out of their position; to hurl woe upon woe against them, if perchance they might be terrified into the belief of a righteous Judge, and, seeing their condition, begin to ask, What must we do to be saved?

It was in this way that our Lord taught His ministers most emphatically, that though they were to be ministers of grace and reconciliation, yet the reproof of sin would ever be a most essential, though a very

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

difficult part of their office. "Every part of the duty of a minister," says a distinguished writer, "is more easy than to maintain in vigour the spirit he needs as the reprover of sin and the guardian of virtue." * Our Lord left men in no doubt what He thought of sin. The denunciations of it which he uttered were really what cost Him His life. And when Peter followed Him on the day of Pentecost and other days, He was equally explicit. He arraigned His hearers as murderers of the Prince of Life. He made no mystery of what they deserved. And then, when their anxious faces and cries of distraction showed that His words had told—that they were subdued and brought to bay, He brought out for them, as it were, that grace of God which is so rich and free to every penitent, and He promised them all the blessings of redemption, through the blood of the very Man whom they had crucified and slain.

The other class of self-righteous persons with whom our Lord dealt were respectable men, without hypocrisy, but who had a higher opinion of themselves than they ought to have had. The young ruler who believed that from his youth he had kept all the commandments was one of these. So also were some to whom the first part of the Sermon on the Mount was addressed—persons who did not know that "unless their righteousness exceeded that of the Scribes and Pharisees, they would in no wise enter into the kingdom of God." In dealing with such persons, Christ's method was to show the searching nature of the Divine law, and for this end He showed them that the law imposed a test which human nature could not endure. He showed that the Word of God was quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, dividing even between the joints and marrow, and that it was a discernor of the hearts of men. A lascivious lust is adultery; a savage feeling is murder. This is the way to deal with respectable formalism. The spirituality of God's nature and the corresponding spirituality of His law, show how hopeless it is to expect salvation by works. He that sets our iniquities before Him, our secret sins in the light of His countenance; He that desires truth in the inward parts, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and who cannot look upon sin, has a far higher standard of judgment than most suppose. The law by its very nature is law; it knows no relaxation and no indulgence; if once its condemnation falls upon you, "Thou shalt in no wise come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

III. A third class of persons outside the kingdom with whom our Lord had often to deal were cavillers,—persons who sneered in their hearts at His doctrine, and tried to trip Him up before the people. It was one of the most memorable features of His ministry that He was always so ready for this class, and that He so uniformly succeeded in turning their position and in making their very cavils the occasion of utter defeat. This shows the thoroughness of His composure, and the

* "Saturday Night," by Isaac Taylor, p. 183.

marvellous discipline of His mind and command of His faculties ; it may likewise be regarded as an indication of God's readiness to give special and peculiar help to those who, in the course of their duty, are exposed to such cavils. Missionaries to the heathen, and labourers at home who come in contact with free thinkers, may find invaluable hints in our Lord's method of dealing with cavillers. Among His various ways of meeting them we may note the following:—

1. Appeals to the paramount authority of *Scripture*—the cavillers in this case being persons who admit that authority. Sometimes His appeal to Scripture was in the direct form, as when He said to the Sadducees, who wished to throw ridicule on the resurrection, "Ye do err, *not knowing the Scriptures* nor the power of God." Sometimes the reference was to a Scriptural example: "Have ye never read what David did, how he entered the temple and did eat the shew-bread, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat?"

2. Referring the thing objected to to *an admitted principle*, which he sometimes brought forward as a proverb, or at least as an admitted maxim of common-sense. How could He cast out devils by Beelzebub, when common-sense might show them that no kingdom divided against itself could stand? His eating with publicans and sinners need not create surprise, since every one knew that "they that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." If His disciples did not adopt all the ways of life characteristic of the old economy, it was because no one of common-sense put new wine in old bottles or a new patch on an old garment.

3. The *argumentum ad hominem*: "Which of you having an ox or an ass fallen into a pit on the Sabbath day, doth he not straightway pull him out?"

4. *Making His hearers judges* in a supposed similar case, and thus getting them to condemn themselves. The parable of the Two Debtors is an example ; it was put to Simon, who had been cavilling in his heart at Christ's treatment of the woman that was a sinner, whether the debtor that had been forgiven much or the one who had been forgiven little had most love ; and when Simon gave his answer, the vindication of the woman and of Jesus' treatment of her was complete.

5. *Allegorical* : the principle being the same as in the last case, but no formal appeal for an answer being made to the objectors. In such allegories as the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, the point objected to is placed in a peculiarly bright and convincing light, and the position of Christ vindicated so triumphantly that the objectors seem annihilated—they are not to be found.

6. *Dramatic*, as when He set a child in the midst of the company to show who should be greatest in the kingdom of God.

Perhaps the most instructive thing in our Lord's method of dealing with cavillers was His frequent practice of using their cavils as pegs on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

which to hang some of His most beautiful discourses. The parable of the Good Samaritan, for example, owed its birth to the question of a lawyer, "Who is my neighbour?"—the object of the lawyer having been to tempt him. Another act of derision on the part of the Pharisees gave rise to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus; and, to give but one other instance, that beautiful word to the young—the very charter of their standing in the kingdom of God—"Suffer little children to come unto me," was occasioned by the attempt of the disciples to hinder the parents from bringing their children to Him. This practice of our Lord's,—of making man's captiousness a mint to coin heavenly treasure; of turning man's exhibitions of malice and evil into occasions for bringing forth the riches of Divine grace; of making heavenly wisdom spring from the soil of folly,—was a very remarkable one, and might of itself have justified the saying, "Never man spake as this Man." In nature, nothing is more remarkable than the manner in which beauty springs from the womb of corruption. The rotten leaves of past years feed the plants and enlarge the produce of the future; the very dunghill becomes the nursery of the choicest flowers, the most fragrant smells, and the most delicious fruits. The origin of evil has always been, and will continue to be, an inscrutable mystery; but that which throws most light on it is the way in which the sin of man is made to illustrate the grace of God. The same thing is true of the use which our Lord made of the annoyances which He encountered so often in His work. The way in which these sprouts of malice became occasions for the manifestation of surpassing wisdom and grace was typical of the grand culminating fact of Calvary, where the greatest crime that miscreants ever committed became the occasion of the most glorious act of love that God or man ever conceived.

IV. A fourth class of persons outside the kingdom with whom our Lord had dealings were those who remained unbelieving and impenitent, notwithstanding all that He said and did among them. Here, too, as in the case of the ungodly self-righteous, our Lord's language was very severe: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida; for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained to this day. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." And again: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas: and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost

256 OUR LORD'S DEALING WITH DIFFERENT CLASSES.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

The tone of rebuke in these passages is so similar to that of the words directed, as we have seen, against ungodly hypocrisy, as to lead us to conclude that, in the judgment of Christ, to trample on God's law and to reject God's Son, are offences of equal magnitude. This is a conclusion that the world will not readily accept. To tread on the moral law, it is allowed, indicates a very disorderly nature; and to continue to do so against all remonstrance and call to repentance and reformation exposes one to just retribution. But declining to acknowledge the claims of Christ, and declining to receive salvation at His hands, are acts which many place in a very different category. What we are to think of Christ is matter of opinion, and it were hard to treat those who are not impressed by His claims as if they were thieves or liars. Against this, it is enough to place the solemn judgment of Christ, that Tyre and Sidon, and Sodom itself, were less guilty than Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum. The great sin of the latter cities was rejection of Christ; the older cities were full of scandalous sins, some of them sins of sensuality, outwardly the most stinking and offensive of all. But if the moral law is a reflection of the Divine attributes, and on that account worthy of our highest reverence, so also is the person of Jesus Christ. Rejection of Christ involves the same antagonism to God as the violation of His law. Especially when Christ is rejected in such circumstances as those in which the Galilean cities rejected Him,—that is, amid a blaze of miracles that might have convinced the most incredulous. So to refuse to own Him, when He comes bringing salvation, argues an inveteracy of opposition betokening the carnal mind, which is enmity against God.

One purpose of this tone of sharp rebuke in the case of unimpressed hearers, as in the case of godless formalists, was doubtless to startle them, and give them a last chance, as it were, of escaping the consequences of their guilt. There is nothing in our Lord's tone to indicate that sense of wounded vanity on His part, which you often find in the rebukes of men ambitious of a popularity which they have not attained. In His severest reprimands we may note an undertone of compassion, the feeling that burst forth so as to overpower Him, as He foretold the doom of Jerusalem—Jerusalem that stoned the prophets and killed them that were sent to her. In most cases the tone is that of the Righteous Judge. If men sin wilfully after they have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. It is an awful proof of the viciousness of sin, that through the revelation of a Father's love and a Saviour's grace, it is capable of being aggravated to greater degrees of criminality, and of leading on to a more fearful doom. Surely we may gather from this that no ministry can be faithful which does not solemnly reprove

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

and warn all who refuse the Lord Jesus Christ. We must not be afraid to tell them what Jesus Christ told them, that the men of Nineveh will rise up in the judgment against them to condemn them. Our warnings, delivered in the right spirit, may be the means of startling them into repentance; anyhow, we shall dispel the delusion that the death of Christ justifies indifference to the real nature of sin, or that there is any way but that of personal acceptance of Him and continual communion with Him by which we may flee from the wrath to come.

FRIENDS IN COUNCIL CONCERNING PRESBYTERIANISM.*

"I BELIEVE that Presbyterianism, give it additional openness and spring, is the closest approach to Apostolic Christianity the world possesses." So said Mr. Betterworth to his three companions. And Mr. Betterworth had a right to offer an opinion upon Presbyterianism. He had not supped upon the sincere milk of the Shorter Catechism in his childhood, nor inherited a taste for strong theology through ten generations of stubborn Scots. He was an Englishman by birth, and had been brought up a Congregationalist. His father, a lineal descendant of one of Cromwell's Ironsides, had been a man of more than ordinary vigour of mind. The son had inherited the father's independence of character and deep sense of the spirituality of religion, and to this he had added, as a contribution possibly from the other side of the house, an unusual openness to outward impressions, and capability of putting himself in the place of his antagonist in argument. He had received a liberal education; he loved study; and his resources, though small enough to forbid idleness, were large enough to enable him to indulge the literary tastes in which he delighted, without the necessity of seeking to turn the profits of his pen to the best pecuniary advantage. Such being Mr. Betterworth, he had a right to unburden his soul on the subject of Presbyterianism.

His companions, to be brief, were his own daughter, Rose; Mr. Whitewing, a popular curate of the Church of England, who was also a distant relation of his own; and Mr. Frederick Freelance, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, who had fallen in with Whitewing in their holiday ramble, and struck up with him a holiday alliance for purposes of united and sympathetic sight-seeing.

The present place of rendezvous was Rome, or, more exactly, a

* The papers which bear this title must be ranked in point of authority with our recent Symposium on "Progress in Theology," the object being rather to ventilate opinions than to enforce conclusions.—Ed. C.P.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

delightful spot three miles out, through the Ostian gate, into the rugged brown Campagna, a settlement of French Trappists, the supposed scene of the martyrdom of the Apostle Paul. The four companions lay on the soft, green sward of that oasis in the desert, under the balm-breathing eucalyptus trees, which drank up the poisonous moisture through their thirsty roots, turning it into wholesome resin, and within sight of a pale-faced monk, who had given them permission, with the characteristic courtesy of France, to rest among the shrubs and flowers, while he told his beads at the door of an adjoining oratory.

It was the last available month for visiting the place. A few weeks more and May would be laying a fiery finger on the soil, and from every ridge and hollow, exhalations of a million faded blooms, and of who can say how many generations of buried men and women, would be tainting the air, and closing up the Romans in the streets of their city, and the twelve Trappists of the Tre Fontane in the patch of green and golden loveliness their predecessors had redeemed from the general wreck.

Of the three old chapels which stood within that little plot of ground, that nearest the ruinous entrance-arch was said to have been on the site of a cemetery where twelve thousand Christians, employed in the building of the baths of Diocletian, had been buried. If this were so, the very tea-roses and eucalyptus cones that were impregnating the air with their perfume must have been largely made up of that which once was man. Yet whatever immediately met the eye was beautiful. The great silence of the outside plain was broken by a thousand near noises of leaf, and bird, and bee, and bubbling fountain. The grey old entrance-arch, festooned with creeping and clinging greens, and the three quaint mediæval churches, which stood shoulder to shoulder like Chelsea pensioners on parade, gave the place a peculiar dignity. Every inch of the soil besides had been lovingly cultivated, and was fresh with daily watering from the well. Masses of foliage hedged off the little settlement from the swampy waste around, but permitted vignette views of the Apennines, or the nearer slopes and villas of the Alban hills. If there be such a thing as the loveliness of melancholy, that loveliness was there. And now, in the midst of it all, four sensible Britons reclined in the grateful shade, taking in fresh impressions of that dead and buried past out of which we have all emerged, and borne forward into the unborn future on the wings of the swift-flying bird of passage called *To-day*.

"I believe," said Mr. Betterworth, "that Presbyterianism, give it additional openness and spring, is the closest approach to Apostolic Christianity the world possesses."

"Your creed is briefer than the Apostles' Creed," Mr. Whitewing replied; "but permit me to say, it is not so categorical. 'Give it more openness and spring,' you throw in, setting us, no doubt, an interesting sum in addition. But does it not strike you, sir, that by a judicious

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

use of the first four rules of arithmetic, you might make any religious system precisely what you please. What do you believe about Presbyterianism as it actually is?"

"Well, if I admit that, in most of its existing forms, it is far from what it ought to be, I make no very damaging admission after all, if I can show that, even in its imperfections, it will compare favourably with surrounding systems. Its perfections, besides, are its own; its imperfections are those of its careless or disloyal followers. Where spiritual life is low, I acknowledge its incompetence. Your Roman, with his beads, and relics, and crucifixes, his imposing ceremonial of worship, his pomp of music and architecture, his thousand roots of old association struck into the soil of the great pathetic past, completely loses sight of the individual in the function. Even your Anglican, with whatever of good he may have added to the Roman form, or evil he may have subtracted from it, if I may borrow your arithmetical simile, Whitewing, has a score of salvos against the inefficiency of the individual. Granted that his preaching may sometimes be but sorry stuff, at least he cannot deprive the people of canticle and collect, of the decalogue and its responses, the litany and its refrains, and of a goodly mass of Scriptural instruction carved out of the Old Testament and the New. But heaven help the Presbyterian congregation whose officiating minister is other than he ought to be; for no earthly remedy is theirs. They have no time-honoured form to fall back upon. The prayers of Ambrose and Augustin, Athanasius and Chrysostom, are lost chords in their cardi-phonía. The minister must pray in his own poor shambling speech, choose his psalms and chapters in whatever eccentric way he pleases, pour forth his own ill-digested thoughts in ill-compacted paragraphs. The ordering of the whole service is left to his sole discretion. There may be better readers than he in the congregation, but he must read; better framers of prayer, but he must pray; better orators, but he must preach. Then again, if he has intrusted his thoughts to manuscript, it will be all the better, in the view of the average congregation, that he should make a second entrustment of them to his memory, and give forth, as impromptus and inspirations, what are, after all, but laborious recollections."

"It seems to me," said Whitewing, "that you have made out a tolerably damaging indictment against Presbyterianism."

"Not at all. I have only been pointing out the abuses to which Presbyterian worship is exposed. That worship lays a tremendous strain upon the man; but if the man be able to bear the strain, what light and life may he not import into the service, what glow of personal conviction, what fusing flame of Divine enthusiasm!—a very prophet and apostle he, symbol and follower of the High Priest of his profession, a messenger straight from the skies, and baptised with the Holy Ghost and with fire. What exquisitely worded prayer of printed book, or dainty paragraph of penned discourse, could counterbalance that

prophetic fire and apostolic zeal? No, no! let the ministry of my Church be anything like what they ought to be, and they mount above the low levels of a mechanically constructed service as those Sabine hills over yonder rise above the Campagna with their thousand villas glittering in the sun."

"But do you then ever find your ideal realised in the practical life and worship of the Church?"

"As to that, I have more things to say than befits a brief hour's chat on the greensward of the Tre Fontane. For one thing, is it not good to have the highest ideal of worship before us, though we may constantly fall short of it? Then, again, I am disposed to think that that ideal is realised more frequently than we imagine. I picture to myself many a quiet countryside, where the worshippers are weekly fanned into a flame of fresh loyalty to Christ, and borne back from the sanctuary to their homes and labours on the wings of a thanksgiving to God, awakened within them by the simple trust and unstudied eloquence of some pastor whose name has scarcely passed beyond the bounds of the presbytery to which he belongs. In the strong and various life of large towns, I admit, the ideal is not so easily reached. On the one hand the public taste is more advanced and exacting, on the other the distracting influences are immensely multiplied. And I frankly own that, in consideration of the strain upon the single minister in the city charge, I should like to see some deviation allowed from the existing custom of the Church."

"And in what direction, may I ask?" said Whitewing.

"I think there should be at least one common prayer, carefully and reverently compiled from the best sources of devotion, which the minister might use at discretion, when he feels the burden of public supplication press too heavily upon his spirit. It seems a sad misplacement of energy, too, that he should be expected to expend, in the reading of the Word of God in the loud tone which a large church requires, the reserve force that might be so much more beneficially concentrated on those parts of the service for which his faculty and training peculiarly qualify him. I calculate that a Presbyterian minister has twice as much physical effort, and four times as much intellectual effort, to be responsible for, as the average parson of the Church of England. The Prime Minister of England reads the lessons in the parish Church at Hawarden; why should not one of the elders, or some respected member of the congregation, read the lessons in every Presbyterian Church?"

"In the case of the common prayer, too, broken up as it ought to be into numerous brief petitions, I concede to you, Whitewing, that I should like to hear the people softly accompanying with their voices the voice of the chief speaker; or, at all events, everywhere throughout the service, when any element of worship is begun or ended with a phrase of invocation or ascription, it would please me well to hear the old

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Amen of Ebal and Gerizim loudly sounded forth from the mouth of every worshipper."

"But, father," broke in Rose Betterworth, who had hitherto been an earnest listener only, "have I not often heard you speaking unfavourably of the forms of the Church of England service?—if Mr. Whitewing will excuse me for saying so."

"I hate the form that starves my ideal, Rose; I love the form that feeds it. Do I prize my daughter less that she looks up at me with those questioning eyes, and that flush of rebellious colour in her cheek? The form to me is lovely just in proportion as it is the exponent of the loveliness of the spirit that looks and listens through it. The form that embosoms the soul of devotion I cling to; it is only the form which entombs it that I reject. Every church service besides has a form of its own. Formlessness is simply impossible, while we are soul and body, and the Church is visible. That I should think the Anglican service overladen with form is no reason why I should not think the Presbyterian over-negligent of form."

"But you acknowledge," Rose replied, "that the original service of the Christian Church was simple and free, and that all the corruptions of the Church of Rome crept in by slow degrees. May not these innovations you propose be but the thin end of the wedge preparing the way for fatal deflections from the old simplicity and freedom? Does not history repeat itself?"

"No, my rapidly-opening Rose," said Mr. Betterworth, with a smile, "history never really repeats itself. The race grows just as the individual grows. You may doubtless do to-day things exactly like what you did when you were a little girl, but you cannot make yourself a little girl again by doing them. So the Church, however liable she may be to fall into old errors, is not the Church which fell originally into those errors. She has her own history to be her beacon. The story of Rome will never be told again. I do not deny that the human heart is as liable to err as ever. I only argue that old memories are a guard against old dangers. The burnt child dreads the fire. The Church may wander again from God; but she will wander along new avenues."

"But is it not a principle of Presbyterianism," said Miss Betterworth returning to the charge, "that we should not import into the worship or government of the Church anything for which we have not the sanction of Christ or his Apostles?"

"True; but under limitations. Our Confession of Faith in its noble opening chapter says: 'There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.' Let me take one circumstance concerning the government of the Church, and one circumstance concerning the

worship of God, by way of example. And first, as to *government*. The chasm between the teaching and the ruling elders is far wider in the Presbyterianism of the Edinburgh of to-day than in the Presbyterianism of the Ephesus of the first century. The teaching elder of the primitive Church was probably nothing more than the most effective speaker among the elders that bore rule in each Christian community. The teaching elder of these later ages receives a long collegiate training for his task, derives his emoluments from his office, and uniformly presides in the ecclesiastical court. But these modifications of function are in accordance with the 'general rules of the Word' of God. The elders are all equal. Even the Moderator of the General Assembly himself is no more than *primus inter pares*.

"Then, again, in the department of *worship*, the use of an instrumental aid comes under the same rule of 'common sense' and 'Christian prudence' as the use of an educated and paid ministry in the department of polity. I lay comparatively little stress on the argument that instrumental music was used by Divine sanction in the Old Dispensation and not repealed in the New. I build rather on the consideration that it is wholly abhorrent to the spirit of the Gospel age to legislate on mere mechanical details accompanying worship. When the Confession says in another place: 'The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture,'—I apply such words as these to the instrumental-music question, not by showing that instrumental music is a way of worshipping God prescribed in Scripture, but by denying that instrumental music is a way of worshipping God at all. We worship God with the spirit, and not with either voice or instrument. It really seems to me to be imputing to the Governor of all something like what we would call a petty, officious, intrusiveness in an earthly governor, when we suppose Him to be profoundly concerned about the material vehicle through which the praises of the heart are made to ascend to Him. And it is noteworthy that the Confession makes no allusion to instrumental aids in worship, although they had been in common use in the Church for centuries. It, therefore, deliberately declines to condemn them, and herein shows itself wiser and more generous than some of those who boast themselves to be its most faithful followers."

"Is it not so, Mr. Betterworth," said Whitewing, "that the anti-instrumentalists in your Church are generally found affirming also that the Book of Psalms is the only lawful manual of praise in public worship?"

"That is undoubtedly the case."

"How, then, do they manage to extract the instruments out of the psalms?"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

"Well, they have a variety of expedients for the purpose. One popular argument is, that the number of psalms which recommend instruments is greatly over-estimated,—they could almost be counted on your fingers, and certainly do not go beyond the teens. Sometimes they allege that the instruments in question are not real instruments at all, but symbols of the heartstrings, or metaphors for the sound of the human voice. Sometimes they admit them to be real instruments, but contend that they were part of the Levitical system, and are involved in its abolition. Sometimes they even go so far as to speak of them with bated breath, as if they were a sort of flaw which was allowed, in some mysterious way, to creep in among the products of inspiration, through the weakness of David and his fellow-minstrels."

"Why, these arguments seem to me to answer themselves," said Whitewing; "but on what ground, may I ask, do they affirm that the Christian Church is to confine itself to the body of praise included within the covers of the Book of Psalms?"

"I happened to be paying a visit to a school companion in Belfast three years ago," said Rose Betterworth, "at the time the General Assembly was sitting there, and she took me to hear a great debate upon this very subject. One of the speakers, a stately, fine-looking man, for whom the brethren seemed to have a great respect, was dealing with the difficulty that prayers are human compositions, and why should not praises be? and he argued in loud and flute-like tones that there is a radical difference between the character of prayer and praise. Prayer, he said, was expressive of human need, and was, therefore, fittingly clothed in human speech; but praise was an ascription of glory to God, and could only be rightly and reverently rendered in language expressly put into men's mouths for the purpose. Several of the ministers applauded, and an immense mass of elders, who sat in close-packed ranks behind them, took up the applause with tremendous energy. I confess I felt there must be something forcible in the argument which called forth such forcible approval."

"I fear, if we were to take all the psalms out of our prayers, and all the prayers out of our psalms, Rose, we should have but little of either psalms or prayers left. Where is the passage in the Divine Word which teaches that we may not thank God for His goodness, or give Him glory for His holiness, in the natural language of the heart? And why, if we may do so in ordinary speech, may we not do so in musical speech, or song? To argue otherwise is to bring ourselves within range of that rule of the Confession, 'God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship.' Admitting most cordially the wonderful depth and surpassing glory of the Psalter, it seems to me repugnant alike to common sense and to the liberty of the Gospel Dispensation to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

allege that the Christian Church must confine her praise to the poems of a single book of the Old Testament."

"Then it appears," said Whitewing, "that the difference between your position and ours on the subject of forms and modes of worship is one of degree and not of kind. We go a little further than you: that is all."

"No: that is not all. The difference verges towards one of kind with you, and falls into one of kind with the Church of Rome. To pray to God in an unknown tongue, or to pray to God in a musical monotone which would insure the contemptuous rejection of our request at the hand of man, is one thing: to use some simple comprehensive form of prayer, summing up the common needs of the people, and drawing forth from the lips of the people intelligent repetitions, or devout responses, is an essentially different thing. To drown congregational praise in a torrent of strong instrumentation, or to entangle it in a maze of involved instrumentation, is one thing: to use instrumental aid as a remedy for the slackness and flattening of the voices of the congregation, or as a guard against the fluctuations and caprices of the choir, is an essentially different thing. There is a form that quickens and a form that kills. I fear not the form that secures me 'decency and order,' I suspect the form that brings me more."

"Then," said Rose, "do you think we are wiser than our forefathers, who rejected these innovations which you recommend?"

"Not wiser as persons, but wiser as a society. It is no praise to us, or disparagement to them, to say that we see things in wider lights than our forefathers. The popular growth in knowledge and taste during the last fifty years is in some respects equal to that of the five centuries preceding them. It would be wearisome to go over the long catalogue of inventions by which the outlets of our ordinary life have been enlarged, and its interests multiplied. Poor men have appliances at their disposal to-day which kings would have vainly sighed for half-a-century ago. Consider the growth of national education, and the growth of the great political idea, which is really a Scriptural idea transported into the political sphere, of the freedom and equality of man. Must the form and movement of the Church, then, remain unaffected in the midst of this tremendous social revolution? It would be infatuation to imagine such a thing either desirable or possible. *Tempora mutantur* and the rest was the motto of the old evolution, before Charles Darwin's "Origin of Species" was conceived, or the flowers of his grandfather's "Botanic Garden" began to fall in love with one another. That old patristic canon covers the whole case:—*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*. Our forefathers were wise in their day. We should be foolish if we followed them in everything, even as they would have been foolish if they had followed their forefathers in everything. Our wisdom lies just where theirs lay, in the legitimacy and discretion of our innovations. What! shall Martin Luther, or

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Ulric Zwinglius, or John Knox, shake all Christendom out of its millennial dream of salvation by matter into the glorious awakening of salvation by faith, and break down a host of pernicious dogmas, that were crushing the very life out of the Christian revelation, at a single stroke, and shall we be denied the paltry right of refurbishing some rusty accessory of worship or polity? Were the reformers then equal to the apostles in inspiration, and superior to the apostles in this, that inspiration ended with them for ever?"

"The sentiments you have expressed, Mr. Betterworth," exclaimed Whitewing, after a moment or two of pause, "do credit both to your head and heart. And it is needless for me to point out to one who is so much better versed in the history of the Church to which he belongs than I can pretend to be, that the Presbyterian family of Churches has by no means shown itself so coy towards liturgical forms as the present distaste for them would seem to imply. Liturgies were introduced into all the Protestant Churches at the Reformation. Liturgies are employed down to the present day in the French and German Presbyterian Churches. John Knox with others compiled a liturgy, which was at least optionally employed by him and his successors in the Scottish Church down to the date of the Westminster Assembly. It was not really the Reformation of the sixteenth century, but the refinement of the seventeenth, which was the death-blow to the liturgical element in British Presbyterianism. For myself," added Mr. Whitewing, "as a member of a Church that has uniformly availed itself of liturgical forms, I must confess that to me they are safeguards and nourishers of devotion. Our English liturgy is no child of circumstance. It is the survival of whatever was purest and tenderest in the old immemorial worship of the Church. Devout outpourings of the sagest and saintliest of men, breathed down to us from days when as yet disruption of the Church was an impossible thought, are set like jewels side by side in the enchasement of its manly, beautiful English. Is it nothing to feel that St. Ambrose prays with us here, here St. Augustine repents, Chrysostom here confesses his faith, here Athanasius blows his bugle note of war against error and wrong? Nor did we draw these canticles of Scripture and collects of the saints out of some deep oblivion into which they had fallen. They had been living all along in the devotions of the Church. The web of the trusts and sorrows of fifty generations of worshippers was woven around them. They have been the diurnal throb of the heart and heaving of the breast of Christendom since Christendom began to be, the supporting rods round which each new generation's spiritual aspirings twined themselves, the conduits through which the water of life flowed down into an endless line of human souls from the throne of God and of the Lamb. Picture only the influence they have wielded since they were grouped together in the dress of our Saxon speech. Consider that wherever through all the world our tongue is spoken, there, at the same corresponding hour

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

of the day throughout this Easter week, the same sweet simple words of filial trust ascend to the throne of the heavenly grace. India, Egypt, Italy, England, America, China, or wherever between these places the British tongue is spoken, successively catch up the echo of song or supplication. Weather-beaten sailors, grouped around their captain on the deck, listen among the wash of the waves to words that are even then being spoken in the hamlets, or sung in the cathedrals of their native land; and a bond as strong and tender as that of family love binds them to mother church and mother country. They weep while they remember Zion. They bow their stalwart frames in emotions of mingled regret and hope, while the image of the village church, with its group of graves around and its group of worshippers within, is recalled to memory, and they reflect that their nearest and dearest ones are praying for them in the very words they themselves are using now, and that somewhere, far away above both sea and land, those mutual intercessions, clothed in the same sweet speech, are gently joined together, and together are caught up by the great Advocate and presented to the Eternal King. Who can gauge the effect of such an influence? The very recurrence of those sacred sentences from week to week, though often brought as an argument against our liturgy, is in reality the secret of the hold it has upon the heart. Earnest minds do not object to the frequent repetition of that which is felt to be best. The wisely worded, pleasantly modulated prayer comes back to such with increasing power and pathos, as the associations of their spiritual life are more and more thickly woven around it; and when to these are added the grand association of the whole living Church of to-day, and the whole departed Church of ten or fifteen centuries, I confess that I can conceive of no earthly influence more excellently fitted to nourish and mould the religious life of those who use it than our English liturgy."

"Really, Whitewing," said Mr. Betterworth, "I not only admire the eloquence, but admit the force of much of what you say. The influence of forms in shaping the religious life of those who use them is immense. The English liturgy, I must acknowledge, has been to the English Church what the songs of Tyrtæus were to Sparta, or Luther's hymns to the Reformation—its aliment and inspiration. Leaving its doctrinal bias out of account, the liturgy expresses the common needs and cravings of sinful men, I acknowledge, in a form as nearly as possible approaching to perfection, neither rising to heights nor sinking to depths that are unfitted for the general body of a Christian congregation. But consider, on the other hand, how serious an infringement it is of the liberties of the people of God that their entire public devotions should be closed up within the framework of words that were uttered, as the litany was probably uttered, one thousand years ago. Why should I, a living man, be forced to confine myself to the speech of men of thirty generations back? There might be some plausibility in arguing for

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

the exclusive use of a purely Scriptural liturgy. But when once the sacred pale of inspiration is past, what other pale can be lawfully set up as a check upon the liberties of Christian men? There is something repugnant to the spirit of the New Testament in read prayers; but when it is further required that nothing but read prayers can be publicly presented to God, the yoke becomes too grievous to be borne. If all men were baptised with the Holy Ghost, liturgies would be broken off, like Samson's withes, from the spirits of worshippers. That great enthusiasm in which the Church began its history, kept liturgical forms out of the Christian service for 300 years, and when they did begin to appear they were as numerous as the Christian communities using them, and they were of the nature of optional resources rather than of impositions. It was deeply realised in those days of persecution and martyrdom that no fixed forms of speech could properly represent the daily needs of men who had such facts as burning, crucifixion, or fighting with wild beast, to grapple with. And human nature is the same in every age. If the primitive Christians needed free prayer, we need it too. If for them there were continually recurring events of life, or emotions of the souls for which no tabulated prayer could furnish a fitting vehicle of expression, the same holds good of us. Could the prayer-book of the Irish Episcopal Church express the agonised desires of the God-fearing people of that misguided land, when ferocious crimes were following one another too fast to be counted through whole provinces, with anything approaching to the effect of sentences springing straight from the heart, and shaped by the very chisel of the events themselves?"

"And would you then bow the prayer-book out of public worship altogether?" asked Whitewing.

"No, no; I would meet it half-way, in view of the manifest disadvantages under which the practice of free prayer labours. Our ministers are not all they ought to be. Some of them should not be in the ministry at all; and to hear these read prayers from a printed book would be less shocking than to hear them extemporise. Some good ministers, again, are deficient in the gift of prayer. Or, again, even where the gift of prayer exists, the exercise of the gift may at times be difficult. Or, finally, where there is no disqualification whatever in the minister, there may be a difficulty among a section of the congregation in following an unknown series of supplications, which does not attach to a series set forth before the eye, or stored up in the memory. Or if it be pleaded that the practice of free prayer commonly condenses of its own accord into some sort of liturgical form, I quote that very plea in corroboration of my point. For, as between a liturgy chosen by the Church, and the capricious liturgy of an individual, there can be no ground for hesitation.

"A liturgy then that shall be optional without being compulsory, supplementary but not exclusive, the fruit of the reverent and decent grouping together of whatever most catholic and fervent utterances have

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

fallen from the lips of the children of light from the beginning of time till now, and no mere composition of an individual or of any committee of men—a liturgy which, in its simplicity of structure, quality of thought, and choice of language, may be at once a model and stimulus to the entire ministry of the Church—such a liturgy I approve of.”

A. C. MURPHY.

(To be continued.)

BIBLE REVISION IN GERMANY.

SIDE by side with the revision of our Authorised Version, which has been going forward in England and America for the last thirteen years, a similar revision has been going steadily forward in Germany. Strictly speaking, the two movements, although parallel, have not been quite contemporaneous. The Germans were earliest at work. By the time that our Company of Revisers had settled down to their labours at Westminster in 1870, the Commissioners to whom the revision had been entrusted in Germany, were already so far advanced as to be able to present the first fruits of their diligence to the Churches of the Fatherland. The Revised German New Testament, exhibiting the final results of their work, was published in 1870. The Commissioners have been employed ever since in the still more formidable task of revising the Old Testament. Already they have presented the public with a foretaste of what is to be expected in this field also. The Sub-Committees charged with the revision of particular sections of the Old Testament have printed certain of these sections, so that all persons interested in the business may know how it is progressing, and may have it in their power to hand in any criticism or practical suggestion that they may desire to submit, before the text passes into its final form. In this way the books of Genesis and the Psalms have already been published provisionally. It is confidently expected that the publication of the whole of the Old Testament, in this provisional or tentative form, will take place before the end of the present year. On every hand it is felt that the fourth centenary of the birth of Luther cannot be more worthily honoured than by the publication of a new edition of the Reformer's most precious gift to Germany and the world.

For some reason or other, this remarkable attempt at Bible revision has received little attention outside of Germany. The time seems appropriate for giving the English-speaking Churches on either side of the Atlantic some account of an enterprise which cannot fail to awaken interest wherever it is understood. In doing this, we will thankfully

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

avail ourselves of the information contained in a lecture recently delivered on the subject by Dr. Kleinert of Berlin, one of the Revisers.*

No one who knows anything of Germany at all needs to be told that there, as in this country, One Version of the Bible has been, since the Reformation, in almost exclusive possession of the field; or that the one version of unrivalled authority is that of Dr. Martin Luther. It is a fact truly astonishing that, while our English Authorised Version was the slow growth of a century, during which it exercised the skill and learning, not only of individual translators like Tyndale and Coverdale, but of whole companies of revisers, like the authors of the Geneva Bible and of King James' revision, the German Bible was produced by a single individual. The success achieved by Luther in this field was immediate and unequivocal, and it has proved to be abiding. Ever since the Reformation, Luther's Bible has been emphatically the Bible of the German people. This has not been due to the absence of competitors. There were German Bibles before Luther—fourteen editions are enumerated by antiquaries—but his was in no sense founded on these, and they were so completely eclipsed by its superior splendour that men soon forgot they had ever existed. Other Reformers too, besides Luther, bent themselves to the task of "making the prophets and apostles (as Luther said) speak the language of the German people." Leo Juda, for example, published a meritorious version in Swiss German. But Luther's alone succeeded in captivating the minds of his countrymen. Since the Reformation, there have been new German Versions without number—some by Protestants, others by Roman Catholics—some good, others very bad; but not one has achieved even a momentary success. Even the admirable version by De Wette is no exception; for, although it has passed through several editions and is much valued for literary purposes, it has never found its way into the hands of the people, and no one uses it for edification. Not only does Luther's Bible stand first in the affections of his people; there is no one that comes second or third. A new German version for the use of the people no sane man would now attempt to produce. Luther's will certainly retain its place as the One German Bible; and all that is left for the friends of the Word of God to do is to have their favourite version *revised* from time to time, so that it may continue to occupy, with unimpaired efficiency, its place of unrivalled authority.

The circumstances which prompted the revision now in progress will readily suggest themselves to those who are acquainted with the analogous case of the revision of our own Authorised Version. So long as Luther lived—and he lived two-and-twenty years after finishing the translation of the whole Bible—he was himself a diligent reviser. Gathering about him Melancthon, Pomeranus, and his other learned colleagues at Wittenberg, he went over the whole Scripture, taking

* "Die revidierte Lutherbibel von Dr. P. Kleinert, Professor der Theologie zu Berlin." Heidelberg, 1883, Pp. 40.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

counsel with them regarding all the hard places, the result being that the new editions which successively appeared exhibited innumerable corrections and alterations of various kinds. After the Reformer's death in 1546, additional alterations were made by his friends, based, at least in part, on notes he had left behind in manuscript. During the following century, there being in Germany no Bible Board or other central authority to control the action of the booksellers, they were free to carry out every one his own notions, as to the alterations permissible and expedient, in the new editions printed from time to time. The consequence was, that the text of the Lutheran Bibles got into a state of extreme disorder, and serious discrepancies between the editions in circulation began to appear. When the Pietists of North Germany, in the early years of the eighteenth century, added to their other charitable projects that of furnishing the people with Bibles well-printed and low-priced, they found themselves confronted with a serious difficulty in the confused and incorrect state of the current texts. To be sure, there were copies extant of the last edition which had been printed under the eye of Luther himself. Would it not have been easy to reproduce the text as it appeared there? Easy, certainly; but not satisfactory. For one thing—the edition in question was itself not perfect; it had its *errata*. Moreover, like all the Bibles produced at the period of the Reformation, it was furnished with prefatory and other *notes*. In some passages the translation was incomplete without these, and would require to be retouched to make it suitable to be printed in cheap editions from which all notes were excluded. Above all, the orthography of the language had so changed that an exact reprint of the edition of 1545 would be a puzzle to plain readers in 1700. Revision was indispensable. Accordingly, Baron Canstein, the Pietist nobleman who founded the Bible Institute at Halle which still bears his name, set to work, and, with the assistance of learned coadjutors, purified the text from the errors which had crept in, revised the orthography, and even made a few indispensable corrections on the translation—in short, did for the Lutheran text much the same sort of service which has been performed, silently, from time to time, for the English Bible, by the press authorities of Oxford and Cambridge. The result was the production of the “Canstein text,” which became the basis of all subsequent editions down to our own time. This text was first printed in 1713.

The Canstein revision was thoroughly well done, and it served its generation satisfactorily. But another period of a century and a half has now elapsed, and the need for a new revision has again made itself felt. There is at the present time no outstanding individual like Baron Canstein to take the work in hand; but the Canstein Bible-Institute exists, and having lately renewed its youth, has been public-spirited enough to put itself at the head of the new movement. The object aimed at, in the first instance, was simply to reproduce *Luther's trans-*

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

lation in a dress suited to the nineteenth century. Happily this is an easier task than it was in 1713. The German of Luther, like the English of Shakespeare, is better understood and appreciated now than it was at any time during the eighteenth century; and there seems to be no doubt whatever that the exquisite felicity of the German of Luther's Bible will shine in the new revision as it never did before. But the question arose—Was no attempt to be made to *amend the translation* in those passages where it is now universally admitted that Luther failed to catch the sense? This is the point where the chief difficulty has been felt in Germany, just as in this country. The feelings of veneration which so long made men shrink from altering a single rendering in our Authorised Version are still more powerful in Germany, in relation to the Luther Bible. Nevertheless, the conviction, after a while, forced itself even on the most unwilling that alterations, more or fewer, there must be. The nature and strength of this necessity are well illustrated in an anecdote told by Dr. Kleinert. The late king of Prussia, Frederick William IV., received a letter from a nobleman of the kingdom, in which he unfolded a scruple of conscience troubling him, in relation to the Lord's Day. He was not satisfied in his conscience that there was any Scriptural warrant for the prevalent religious observance of Sunday in the room of the Old Testament Sabbath. The good king handed the letter to Dr. Nitzsch, a more likely person than any other member of the *Oberkirchenrat* to clear up the matter and remove the nobleman's scruple. The duty thus laid on the learned divine awoke his mind to a sense of the disadvantage to the truth consequent on an unhappy mistranslation of a whole series of texts in Luther's New Testament—those, namely, which refer to the first day of the week as the day of Christ's resurrection, and the consequent sanctification of the day in the Apostolic Church. Without exception, these important texts are rendered by Luther so incorrectly that the meaning is excessively obscure, and for the laity quite unintelligible. The consequence is, that one who knows the Bible only in Luther's version has no means of getting at the truth in regard to the New Testament doctrine of the Lord's Day. Two examples will illustrate this. Matt. xxviii. 1, stands as follows in Luther's version: *am Abend aber des Sabbaths, welcher anbricht am Morgen des ersten Feiertags der Sabbathen* ("on the evening of the Sabbath, which began to dawn on the morning of the first holiday of the Sabbaths.") In Acts xx. 7, in like manner, Luther's rendering is, *auf einen Sabbath aber, da die Jünger zusammen kamen* ("now on a Sabbath day, when the disciples were come together.") Luther was not singular in this rendering. It is found also in Cranmer's New Test. (1539) and in that of Rheims (1582.) In the former the texts run thus: Matt. xxviii. 1, "Upon an evening of the Sabbaths, which dawneth the first day of the Sabbaths;" Acts xx. 7, "And upon one of the Sabbath days, when the disciples came together." One can well understand that Christian men like Nitzsch, in proportion

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

as their hearts were loyal to the Divine Word, felt that they could not, with a clear conscience, help to send the Luther Bible forth with a new lease of life, till they had done their best to remove from it such palpable errors.

It will be a surprise to many to learn that our German brethren, so unrestrained in criticism and speculation, have shown in the work of Bible Revision an amount of caution, not to say timidity, which contrasts remarkably with the boldness of the English and American revisers. The rules they prescribed to themselves at the outset were of the most stringent sort. Pedantic attempts at uniformity and literal accuracy of rendering were to be refused: special care was to be taken not to interfere with words and sentences which had rooted themselves in the devotional speech of the people, even although others more accurately expressing the sense of the original might be easily found: no passage was to be altered unless the revisers were agreed not only as to the need of alteration, but as to the words to be substituted for those set aside: furthermore, in order that the aroma of the time-honoured Bible might be preserved in undiminished sweetness and strength, new-fangled words were to be utterly excluded, the choice of words for the altered renderings being limited to those for which authority can be found in one place or other of Luther's works: finally, after the revisers had resolved upon the alterations to be introduced, the text as thus revised was to be printed and published *in proof*, so that the revisers, before bestowing on it their final touches and launching it out into the world, might know how the various alterations were likely to commend themselves to the general mind of the Churches. In the opinion of not a few, this *last* rule might have been followed with advantage by our English revisers. In accordance with it, the publication of Luther's New Testament in 1870 was preceded by the printing and circulating of a Proof Edition in 1867. Preliminary prints of Genesis and the Psalter have been in circulation since 1873 and 1876, respectively. The intention seems to be, that the edition of the entire Bible now in the press shall not be regarded as exhibiting the text as finally revised, but shall be tentative only, leaving it open for a little while longer to introduce any modifications that may yet be called for, in order to make the new text as perfect as possible.

Detailed criticism on the portions of the Revised text which have already appeared would be out of place here. Without pronouncing on points of which those only are competent to judge to whom German is the mother-tongue, it seems to us that the Revision, so far as it has gone, has fairly answered the hopes of its projectors. Besides a not inconsiderable number of valuable alterations affecting the sense, there has been a general brightening up of the grand old version. The circumstance that fifty-nine distinct impressions of the Revised New Testament have already been called for, proves that it has been accepted by the Christian public; and the examination we have been able to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

give to the sections already in print satisfies us that a similar acceptance awaits the Old Testament also. If there has been error at all, it has been, we cannot help thinking, on the side of excessive dread of change. If our revisers have gone too far, the German revisers have not gone far enough. It seems that there has been some difference of judgment among themselves on this head. What is very interesting, we gather from Dr. Kleinert that the difference corresponds to a difference of *locality*, the revisers belonging to the East and North inclining to the more Conservative side, while those belonging to the South and West—the divines of Wurtemberg and the Rhineland—would have preferred a more thorough revision. This is not a little significant, in view of the fact that the Churches of Wurtemberg and Westphalia are precisely those most distinguished for practical energy in Christian work. The loudest call for Bible Revision, either in Germany or elsewhere, does not come from the circles in which literary and scientific interests are supremely valued. On the contrary, it is in communities pervaded with the profoundest sense of the Divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, and their infinite value for the salvation of souls, that there is to be found the strongest sense of the duty lying on the Church to put her children in possession of the most perfect attainable version of the Bible.

WILLIAM BINNIE.

LAND TENURE IN BIBLE TIMES.

IV.—BEARING ON RECENT QUESTIONS.

IT may not be inappropriate, in concluding these papers, to glance at the bearing of the view we have given of the Israelitish land tenure upon questions which have been raised regarding the origin of the Israelitish laws contained in the Pentateuch.

The view entertained by the modern school of critics is, that the Israelitish legislation contained in the Pentateuch, instead of being an originally complete code or system, prescribed in its entirety by Moses to the people, prior to their entrance into the Promised Land, is a composite or developed system, consisting partly of admittedly Mosaic enactments, and partly of additions from time to time, during the subsequent history of the nation, engrafted upon the Mosaic stock. In accordance with this view, it is held that the greater portion of the legislation contained in the Book of Leviticus, including the whole of the land and jubilee law contained in the 25th chapter, was written down by priestly exiles in Babylon, between the years 538 and 458 before Christ, and officially promulgated by Ezra after the return from

VOL. X.—NO. LVIII.

T

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

the captivity ("Kuenen's Religion of Israel," vol. 2, chap. 7 and note 2; "Kalisch's Commentary on Leviticus," vol. 2, pp. 391-5). These portions of the Israelitish land legislation have, therefore, according to this view, an exilian or post-exilian, and not a Mosaic origin.

This view, like the views generally of that school of critics, is sought to be maintained largely upon literary and linguistic grounds; upon the ground of alleged differences of idiom, and style, and language, between these and other portions of Israelitish law. Now, literary and linguistic considerations have, doubtless, their legitimate place and weight in such inquiries, and where it can unequivocally be shown that words, or phrases, or idioms, or references, are employed which can belong only to a subsequent period, then, it must be conceded that, in so far at least as its form is concerned, the law should be assigned to that period. At the same time it should be remarked—although from the narrative and historic form in which the Israelitish laws are chiefly embodied, the remark has less application to them—that there is no form of composition in which literary and linguistic elements have less play than in the legislative. To dogmatise upon the date of a law merely from its literary structure and style, is to build upon a very inadequate and precarious basis. It is to shut out of view other elements which, in relation at anyrate to such an inquiry, have greater pertinence and force. But even in regard to the literary and linguistic considerations upon which it is sought to maintain the exilian or post-exilian origin of what are termed the Levitical land laws, the weight of scholarship is at least as much in favour of the older view as of the newer, and as the "*onus probandi*," the burden of "showing cause" rests entirely upon those who assail the Mosaic origin of the laws, there is no reason as yet why that position should be surrendered.

But in relation to this and similar questions, there are other considerations which are more relevant and weighty than the merely literary, and of these the modern school of critics do not appear to take adequate account.

There are, in particular, two arguments, each of which is adverse to, and both of which are negative of, the exilian or post-exilian origin of any portion of the Israelitish land system.

The first of these is that founded upon the principle of Unity or Homogeneity. Does the Israelitish land system exhibit the signs and characteristics of a homogeneous or of a composite system,—of an originally perfected or of a developed code? It may be stated, as a rule, that a code or system of laws, promulgated at once, in its entirety, possesses features of unity, coherence, and rigid self-consistence, which are invariably absent from a progressively developed system. In every developed system of law,—that is, in every system which has been moulded, altered, modified, or augmented with the varying circumstances and conditions of national life,—there are manifest traces of adaptation, compromise, and adjustment. Opposite principles and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

motives are at work. There is, on the one hand, the desire to retain as much of the spirit, and even of the letter, of the old legislation as possible; and there is, on the other, the necessity of adapting the law to the altered circumstances and requirements. Hence, legal fictions, and other forms of accommodation, are invented: old terms are stretched to wider applications, and the law itself bears the traces of the process of adaptation and adjustment through which it has passed. Take, for example, the land systems of our own country at the present day. Of the English land law, Justice Stephen, in a recent article, says: "Every one is aware that the law relating to landed property is the standing disgrace of English law. After many attempts to simplify it, it remains as complicated as ever. The reason of this is . . . that the law consists almost entirely of legal fictions, invented for the sake of accommodating the rude institutions of feudalism to gradual changes in the state of society" (*Nineteenth Century*, vol. ii., p. 203). And, as to our Scottish Land Law, all the multitudinous and complicated statutes which have from time to time been passed in relation to land rights, to titles and conveyancing, have simply been legislative attempts to piece the old garment of feudalism with the new fabric of modern economics,—to pour the new wine of modern social and commercial principles into the old smoke-shrivelled skins of mediævalism,—with the inevitable result of exhibiting the rents and incongruities of the process.

Now, if the Israelitish land legislation were a composite or developed system,—if it consisted of elements partly of a Mosaic date, and partly of a date so late as the exile or the restoration,—it would, in some way and to some extent, reveal the traces of the process. Time would have "written wrinkles on its brow." The legislative methods may have been different;—the process of indenting the new materials into the old may have been more or less skilfully performed, but the diversity of the elements themselves would have, in some degree, manifested itself. But the Israelitish land legislation bears no trace of having passed through such a process. It is, from beginning to end, in substance and in form, in spirit and in letter, a rigidly homogeneous, coherent, and congruous system. It exhibits the evidence of having been "originated, in all its parts, by one mind and at one epoch." Starting from the foundation of the Divine ownership of the soil of the covenanted land, it proceeds, consistently and consecutively, to build upon it the possession of the land by the Israelites, as the Lord's chosen people; the equal partition of the land among the families constituting the nation; the return by them of an annual rent or land tax in the appropriate form of religious payments and offerings; the incapacity of the land-holders, who were virtually liferenters, either to alienate or mortgage the land during life, or to disturb the hereditary succession to it after death; the power to them, however, if necessity arose, to dispose of their own limited interest, with a right of redemption if at any time their circum-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

stances should improve, or a kinsman interpose on their behalf. The whole system is marked by the most rigid unity and continuity. It is, throughout, animated by one spirit, and subservient to one great purpose. Each part fits with the utmost precision, without trace of chink or flaw, into every other. Like the members of the body, not only have the several parts a definite organic relation to all the others, but they are all adapted to the special design and purpose of the entire structure, so that, if any one were wanting, the organic unity and completeness of the structure would be destroyed. The whole system, in short, exhibits the marks and characteristics of *unity*,—unity of origin, of purpose, of spirit, and of structure. There is absolutely nothing to suggest or support the idea of growth, development, “compositeness,” or historical progress.

The other argument is that derived from the principle of *historic sequence*. If the Israelitish land legislation presents all the marks and characteristics of an originally complete and perfect system, the question then arises, Into what point or period of history does its origin most accurately fit?

History and law are inseparably interwoven. They mutually create and react upon each other. Each interprets the other. National or municipal laws are not a merely arbitrary set of rules, concocted by the legislature without regard to circumstances of time or place. They are, of course, intended to be prospective in their operation; but their origin must be sought for in the circumstances and requirements of a particular time. The historic relation and sequence of a law afford a truer test of its date than its merely literary form.

Applying, then, this principle of historic sequence to the question at issue, the inquiry occurs, Into what period of history does the Israelitish land system, assuming it to be a homogeneous system, most naturally and exactly fit? Does it piece most precisely into the Mosaic or the exilic stage? Is it animated by the spirit of the exode or the exile? Does it harmonise best with the conquest or the restoration?

To propose these questions to any one conversant with Israelitish history, and the details of the Israelitish land system, is virtually to answer them. It is beyond the range of disputation that the Israelitish land legislation, in its entirety, does square and dovetail most exactly into the Mosaic age. That age is, indeed, the only period of Israelitish history into which it is possible, with any regard to historic order and sequence, to place the land legislation. It assumes the forms, it breathes the spirit, it fulfils the requirements of that particular period. By its Divine ownership and hereditary tenantry of the soil, and its annual return by the cultivators of one-fifth of the produce, it unites the teachings of the sojourn with the spirit of the exodus. Its incorporation and maintenance of family and tribal relations bespeak a period when these prevailed in their primitive integrity and force. Its equal division of the land tells of the conquest, when, to a united people, on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

a footing of social equality, free territorial rights arose, and territorial inequalities could not possibly have sprung up. Its prohibition of alienation and encumbrance, and its careful provisions for the periodic readjustments of the jubilee, are animated by the desire to maintain the early unity and equality of the people, and to preserve the primitive national constitution. The whole substance and form, the spirit and structure, of the land system fit into and harmonise with the Mosaic stage of history.

On the other hand, there do not appear to be any substantial elements of correspondence between the period of the exile or the restoration, and even what is called the "Levitical portion" of the land legislation. Indeed, there is not a period of Israelitish history into which any part of their land legislation fits less naturally than the period of the exile or the return. The unity of the nation had then for centuries been irretrievably broken up, and its independence irremediably destroyed. Part of the nation had gone into exile in Egypt, and other portions had been carried into captivity in Babylon, and in the remote provinces of Assyria. Ten of its tribes had altogether disappeared from view. The country had been devastated by several invasions, and depopulated by voluntary migrations and two captivities; and it was, to a very large extent, possessed either by other peoples or by mixed settlers, who were never afterwards dispossessed, so that there remained for those who should return only the strip of hilly country "round about Jerusalem." And even to that narrow strip the people could return only by the will and as the tributaries of a foreign potentate. Even when the restoration came, it was only very partial in its extent. Comparatively few of the exiles availed themselves of the liberative decree of Cyrus. They enjoyed a liberal measure of freedom, were unrestrained in their intercourse with the native population, and were permitted freely to engage in trade and commerce. Many of them had acquired property and attained to affluence and position which they were not disposed to abandon. Even of the priesthood, only four of its four-and-twenty orders were represented in the homeward procession. The Talmud insists on the fact that the principal families clung to their dwelling between the Euphrates and the Tigris, and that in comparison with them those who returned were but as the chaff. Indeed, neither the immigration under Zerubbabel, in the time of Cyrus, nor those under Ezra and Nehemiah, in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, really affected the Israelitish settlements in the Persian dominions; and the "Jews of the dispersion" are ever afterwards an influential factor in the national history. "The community which returned were," as Dean Stanley says, "no longer a sovereign people, a nation in the full sense of that term." The territorial spirit had disappeared. The Word of God and the Law of God were thenceforth their cherished possession. Their very name was changed, and they are known after the exile, not

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

as Israelites, but as Jews. Their subsequent history is the history, not of Israel but of Judaism. "Israel, after the exile, ceased, or almost ceased, to be a nation, and became a church."

To ascribe, then, to such a period, and to people so situated, the conception or the promulgation of laws, which presuppose the independence, the corporate unity, and the ancient spirit of the nation—which are based upon the freedom and the equal division of the soil, prohibit its alienation, and provide for its periodic return to the families of its original possessors—is contrary to every sound notion of historic order and sequence. A devout exile might possibly in some moment of rapt meditation have dreamed of such a thing; but its embodiment in an actual code of laws, "written down" or "promulgated" at such a time and amid such circumstances, is utterly beyond the sphere of probability. The Israelitish land system as a whole, or the "Levitical portion" of it in particular, synchronises neither with the facts nor the circumstances, nor the spirit of the exile or the restoration. There may possibly, in the present state of knowledge, be difficulties in the way of harmonising all the manifold details of the Pentateuchal laws with a Mosaic origin, but such difficulties dwindle into molehills in comparison with the insuperable mountain which towers in the way of the exilian or post-exilian theory.

Applying, then, these principles of unity or homogeneity, and of historic order and sequence, to the Israelitish land system, the result is entirely negative of the theories of its composite or developed character, and its partially exilian or post-exilian origin, and affirmative of its thorough unity and its wholly Mosaic authorship.

We have thus endeavoured to trace and interpret the historic and legislative records of Scripture, down to the establishment of the theocratic commonwealth of Israel, upon the subject of Land; and we have endeavoured incidentally to show their bearing upon certain apologetic questions of interest at the present day. We have also, as opportunity offered, endeavoured to indicate their application to modern land problems.

It is, of course, unnecessary to repeat that it forms no part of the real purpose of revelation to develop a system upon which, in all lands and at all times, the soil of this temporary abode of man is to be held. To any appeal to the Scriptures for express and authoritative legislation on the subject, the same reply may still be given which was given by our Saviour himself in a question of disputed inheritance: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed and keep yourselves free from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Still, it were strange if, amid these historic and legislative records, relating, as they do, to society in its most primitive forms, to the highest ancient civilisation, and to a state established under immediate Divine direction, no facts or principles could be discovered capable of application to present-day problems.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

While there may be nothing distinctly preceptive, there is not a little that is illuminative.

We discover, for instance, notwithstanding different stages of development, and diverse systems of tenure, the entire subordination of land to the primary purposes of cultivation and pasture, and the support of a numerous and independent peasantry : we find the most continuous and consistent discouragement of anything and everything like the perversion of the soil from these primary purposes to purposes of mere luxury and sport : we trace the uniform acknowledgment of the radical right of the people to the soil of the country, under such reasonable returns to the sovereign as are requisite for purposes of State : we find that such returns, instead of being an inflexible payment, are equitably adjusted to the prosperity or scarcity of the year : we find everything to prevent the alienation of the soil from the many, and its accumulation in the hands of the few : we find everything to secure the union and to prevent the severance of ownership and cultivation : we discover no trace of the undivided descent of the land to a favoured heir, to the exclusion and impoverishment of the remaining members of the family : we search in vain for the trace of any power on the part of the landholder to burden the possessions or fetter the powers of future holders by posthumous provisions : we find full liberty to each landholder to dispose of his own limited interest without encroaching upon the interest of his successors. And we believe that future legislation shall succeed in providing a successful and satisfactory solution of the land problems in our own country, only to the extent in which it breaks away from the artificial conceptions, the legal fictions, the unnatural restrictions which ages of feudalism have gathered, like a fungus growth, around this subject, and returns to the conceptions and principles which underlie and pervade the Scriptural records regarding it.

RICHARD REID.

BOGATZKY AS A LAY PREACHER.

THE name of Bogatzky is widely known to the Christian public. The "Golden Treasury," of which he was the author, has long been prized by large numbers of readers, and has been the companion of their hours of devotion for years upon years. Little curiosity, however, seems to have been excited concerning the man, if we may judge by the fact that edition after edition of the "Treasury" has appeared during the hundred and eight years that it has been in the hands of the English reading public, without any memoir.* Yet as a hymn

* A memoir has been prefixed to the new edition very recently issued by the Religious Tract Society.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

writer and lay preacher, as well as a very voluminous writer of evangelical, doctrinal, and practical books, he exercised a deep and widespread influence on religious life in Germany during a large portion of last century, and his character and career are well worthy of study.

The hymn sung at every ordination in Germany and at the annual festival of the Basle Missionary Society is by him. His autobiography is equally interesting as revealing to us the growth and fruitfulness of a useful Christian character and life, and affording us an insight into the Pietist circles of Germany during the period covered by it. It is to his work as a lay preacher that we propose to devote this paper. It may be said to have extended from the time of his leaving the University of Halle in 1718 till advancing age and infirmity compelled him to give it up in the year 1767, after he had been many years resident in the Orphan House in that place. His work was carried on chiefly among the upper classes, to whose rank he belonged by birth and family connections. It was conducted in accordance with the views and methods of the Pietists. Spener in 1675 formulated the following plan by which they were to seek to quicken and revive the deeply-sunken Evangelical Church* :—

- (1.) The energetic promotion of a more general and thorough familiarity with Holy Scripture by means of private meetings, *ecclesiole in ecclesia*.
- (2.) The development and nurture of the universal priesthood by the co-operation of the laity in the spiritual direction of the congregation, and by means of services in private houses.
- (3.) By insisting that the active practice of Christianity must be connected with the knowledge of it, as its necessary complement and preservative.
- (4.) The transformation of a merely didactic, for the most part, embittered polemic against misbelievers and unbelievers, carried on with a view to producing merely intellectual conviction, into a course of conduct animated by hearty love, and prompted by the living impulse to promote the real improvement of others.
- (5.) A reorganisation of theological study, in the sense that theological students should not only be exhorted to diligent study, but also especially to a godly life.
- (6.) A preaching which aimed at producing a living heart-Christianity, springing from true faith, and producing fruit in the life, instead of a self-complacent and rhetorical kind.

Bogatzky did not come under the immediate influence of Spener, but was brought into contact with and owed much to Franke, the friend and correspondent of Spener; and his life-work was carried on within the lines and in the spirit of this programme.

His devotion to the work of a lay-preacher was the result of providential circumstances which gave his life a different course from what he had anticipated. His first wish, when he began to prepare for the university, was to study theology; but his friend and patron, Count Henry, the twenty-fourth of Reuss-Köstritz, persuaded him to devote himself to jurisprudence, on the ground that there were many Christian

* Article "Pietismus," "Herzog's Real Encyclopädie," Vol. xi., Leipzig, 1883.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

pastors but few Christian statesmen, and that in this latter capacity he could do more good among the upper classes ; but after three years' trial in Jena and Halle, he was constrained to revert to his first thought and wish. After much prayerful consideration, and with the full concurrence of judgment on the part of his friends, he became a theological student. His health, however, broke down, and necessitated the abandonment of the prospect of his ever becoming a pastor.

Before this event took place, and before he knew what shape his future life would take, while still a student in the Juridical Faculty at Jena, he was led for a short time to engage in the kind of work to which he was afterwards called. In consequence of the death of his mother in 1716, he was led to visit Silesia, his native country, and spend four months among his friends and relatives there. He devoted himself to spiritual work among them. We give the account of his visit and his work in his own words :—

"The Lord gave me entrance among them everywhere. He had already prepared the way before me, as all my friends were at that time in trouble or sorrow of one kind or other. Some had been ill and were not fully recovered. Others had lost their children or parents, and others again had met with much misfortune in their affairs, and were pressed much by unmerciful creditors. By these means God had prepared their hearts so that they gave heed to the truths declared to them, and received them. I put before them that a merely outwardly respectable life would not avail for any one before God ; that they must be born again, and get a new heart. They had all been previously acquainted with me, and knew that I had led a pious and virtuous life, and had been diligent in my attendance on public worship ; that on this account I had been held up as an example to other young people, and nevertheless it had been necessary for me to become a new man and get a new heart. I had been brought to experience and acknowledge the wickedness of my heart and my inward sinful condition, and in this way I had been brought to believe. This made such a deep impression on many that they also became truly converted, and remained steadfast unto the end."

His own sister was one of the first converts at this time. One case he records in this connection which may have occurred during his visit to Silesia, which gives us a closer view of his work than the general account quoted. While he was conversing with a certain *Fräulein* von L., what he said appeared to her to be Pharisaic. He gave her Franke's sermon on the Pharisee and Publican, on the difference between true and false righteousness, and asked her to read it attentively and prayerfully. Two days afterwards he visited her again, and she apologised for calling him a Pharisee, and said—"I, I am the Pharisee, I see that clearly from the sermon." She attained a very clear knowledge of the Gospel, endured for some time, but afterwards went back to the world. On her deathbed she was in great distress of mind and would not be comforted, because she had sinned against better knowledge and conscience. After long and severe conflict she appeared to derive comfort from the words : "If we judge ourselves we shall not be condemned with the world." The impression produced

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

upon people by his testimony during this visit was, that he spoke like a minister, and was well fitted to be one.

After the close of his student career, and the abandonment of the prospect of ever entering the ministry, he returned to Silesia and resided there, with occasional interruptions, from 1718 to 1740. During this period he first published his "Treasury," increased it from time to time, as successive editions were called for, but did not complete it till 1744. Other works, of a philanthropic kind, occupied a share of his time and attention, but his chief work seems to have been holding meetings, giving addresses, and acting as the spiritual counsellor and guide among people of his own rank in life.

The best way, perhaps, of giving an idea of his work and its distinctive features, will be to pass in review incidents and passages which represent it in various aspects. The points of resemblance and contrast between his method and teaching, and the method and teaching of the prominent lay preachers of the same and other classes of society with whom we are so familiar in our own day, will readily suggest themselves to our readers.

There is considerable variety of type among the lay evangelists and teachers of the present day, and the degree of divergence and similarity between them and Bogatzky will, of course, be very different in different cases. Bogatzky, it will be seen, had no tendency to drop repentance out of his teaching on the subject of conversion, nor the inward conflict out of his representations of the Christian life, nor to teach men that it was of no use to pray for faith and salvation, nor had he any disposition to adopt doctrinal or other crotchets and vagaries. He never swerved from evangelical Lutheran orthodoxy of a spiritual type.

Early in the period of his life of which we are now treating, in 1719, he paid a visit to his aunt, whose eldest daughter he subsequently married. This young lady was among those who had been impressed by his addresses during his four months' visit to Silesia in 1716. What Bogatzky had said about the conflict that goes on in a penitent soul struck her very forcibly. Soon afterwards she fell dangerously ill, and then it occurred to her that she had never experienced any such conflict, and that it could not be right with her. His various conversations with her while living in the house, and the addresses which he gave at the meetings which he held, were the means of awakening her thoroughly. She passed through a severe conflict, but became and remained to the end a steadfast and consistent Christian.

Another case of a different but striking kind occurred during another visit which he paid to his aunt at a later period. He had been holding evening meetings, when his health broke down and he was confined to bed. While in this weak condition, a certain nobleman and his wife came to see him. The nobleman was known to be a quarrelsome and vindictive man. He had struck and roughly handled another nobleman in the churchyard at Christmas-time, and had been placed under

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

arrest in consequence. Bogatzky was unwilling to receive him, and sought to excuse himself on account of his illness, but his visitor would not be denied. In the conversation that ensued Bogatzky set the truth plainly before him, and told him in particular that he must put away his besetting sin if he would prove himself to be a new man, that the empty honour of the world must be denied, and, even when insulted, he must not seek to avenge his wounded honour at the point of the sword. A deep impression seemed to be made at the time. The truth of what he said was fully admitted. After a time, however, the hasty temper of the nobleman betrayed him into another quarrel, and he was in danger of being challenged to fight a duel. He applied to Bogatzky for advice. His false sense of honour had not been overcome and he was inclined to think that he must vindicate it. He sought to escape from his former acknowledgments of the sin of his proposed course by all sorts of subterfuges and excuses.

"People," he said, "thought that Christians were destitute of heart, and if he showed that he had heart enough and afterwards lived quite a new life, men would all the more readily acknowledge that the change in him was the work of God and not of nature merely."

As an illustration of the wisdom, faithfulness, and thoroughness of Bogatzky in dealing with such cases, I shall give in full the considerations which he urged on the combative nobleman in his own words :—

- (1.) We must not do evil that good may come.
- (2.) He had proved to the world quite sufficiently that he had more heart than the most; it would therefore be regarded as the work of God in him if he denied the vain honour of the world, and refused to fight a duel.
- (3.) Now, since he knew better than he did formerly, such conduct would be more sinful, and God might permit him to be destroyed both in body and soul, as he would be sinning against conscience and clearer light.
- (4.) Something might alleviate the denial to him outwardly if he would only stand firm when the usual names of mockery were applied to him. For it was well known that the people called Pietists never did such things, but rather bore any reproach than sin against God in any such manner.
- (5.) If he neither would nor could deny this worldly lust, this false sense of honour, it would be a sad proof to him that sin had still dominion over him, that he was still destitute of the faith that overcomes the world, as he loved the honour that cometh from man more than the honour that cometh from God. "How can ye believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only" (John v. 44). He must also experience a great change, and be born again, and, as Luther says, "be changed in heart, mind, and spirit, and in all his powers," and that is what true faith effects. He must, therefore, pray right earnestly that the Lord would thoroughly convert him, and preserve him from temptations that might be too strong for him, and help him to resist them."

The nobleman thanked Bogatzky for his instructions, and promised to follow them. He kept his word, and was delivered from the temptation. He remained steadfast through many sufferings to the end, and died in faith and hope. His wife was able to testify to the reality and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

permanence of the change. Before his conversion he used to be like a lion in the house. After it, he was gentle in spirit and in his whole behaviour, particularly towards his wife, who had had much to endure at his hands, and whose own disposition was naturally meek and quiet.

Bogatzky's work was not always permitted to pass without opposition. While on a visit at Schlomwitz to his friends Frau von Trauwitz and her daughters, he held frequent meetings in the evenings, and also every Sunday afternoon, which were attended by people from the village, and were the means of blessing. The Senior of a neighbouring town, whither they usually drove to church, preached against him, and among other things said, "Certain persons do not come to church lest the pure white of their holiness should be spotted by contact with other people."

It is needless to vindicate Bogatzky from the charge of self-righteousness and pride; but, with reference to church attendance, he was frequently unable, on account of the state of his health, to go to church.

At this place, he tells us, the Lord opened the Gospel to him more fully, particularly the article of justification. He had several conversations upon it with his friends, which he found very quickening. There was one in particular to which he refers, in which they agreed,—

"that it was the chief thing in Christianity, the one thing needful, that they should ever seek only to be found in Christ, and they should regard His righteousness, which alone avails before God, as their adorning, inasmuch as they were made acceptable to God the Father, in Christ the beloved, and in His righteousness."

Such conversations as these he highly prized.

"I perceived," he said, "how much they are blessed, especially when we speak to each other of the great salvation that we have in Christ, and seek to build one another upon our most holy faith."

Opportunities occurred to him, as they do to all of a like spirit engaged in similar work, of preaching or bearing testimony for Christ by the way, on journeys. The ungodly conversation of fellow-travellers constrained him to interpose and seek to check it. On one occasion when Bogatzky was travelling to Breslau, the coach was full of passengers, whose talk was frivolous and wicked. "Thou canst not be silent here," he said to himself. He sighed in his heart, and spoke against their evil conversation. Matters became worse. He began to think that he had been premature in reproving them. He prayed more earnestly in his heart, and spoke with greater impressiveness than before, silenced all their reproaches against true Christianity, and showed them what was needful for the salvation of the soul, and in order to become happy. They became very attentive, and tears came into their eyes. One of the party, who had been specially forward in opposition, was convinced and moved at last, and at parting begged Bogatzky's pardon for his misconduct.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

"As these sermons and conversations by the way," he says, "are of rare occurrence, the people in general are so much the more attentive, and much good may be expected to result. A word is often spoken that finds entrance, and one hears of it for the first time long after."

He narrates a case in point from his own experience. Once when travelling in Saxony, he was conversing with several students on their way to the university. Many years afterwards, he learned from an excellent minister, that one of them had been brought to serious reflection by his words on that journey. On his travels, he was brought into contact with members of other communions; and the intercourse he had with them brings out his tolerant and catholic, and yet withal by no means latitudinarian spirit, in a striking manner. He cites two cases of Roman Catholics—one of them an advocate, and an upright and god-fearing man, with whom he had much edifying conversation—the other was a lady who, as he said, had the true fear of God, and put to shame hundreds of Lutherans.

"Examples like these," he adds, "of god-fearing persons of other connections, should not by any means make us indifferent in matters of religion; on the contrary, we should be thankful that we have the pure doctrine of the Word of God in our Church; but they should make us guarded in our judgment, and keep us from the sectarian zeal that anathematizes people of other religious parties. Still less should we think that we Lutherans are the dear children of God, and must all be saved, even though we live unholy lives, and have none of Luther's mind and spirit in us."

After his marriage, while living at Glauchau, in Silesia, he held weekly meetings for prayer and edification in his own house, which were attended by all the noble families in the place; and visited the afflicted and the dying. Of his deathbed ministrations, and the results of them, we shall give one instance. He was called in on one occasion to visit a woman who had kept an hotel, and who had frequently been the subject of convictions, but had always put off her decision. In this last illness she was thoroughly awakened, and was in great distress and fear lest her conversion should not be of the right kind. He said what he thought was necessary to test as well as comfort her, and she died, as he believed, in peace. He took the opportunity to warn many others not to put off their conversion till they should be on a deathbed, or it might happen that, even though their conversion were thorough and real, they might be plunged into terror and anxiety, as this woman was.

"Late conversion, moreover," he said, "is often doubtful, and seldom real; and many are suddenly cut down without being able to think of conversion."

Bogatzky shared the distrust felt towards the Moravians by the Halle theologians, which Bengel had also felt and expressed. He was constrained to write against them. In one edition of the "Golden Treasury" he added matter fitted to serve as an antidote to their errors, without, however, making explicit reference to them. In a separate publication, issued in 1751, he replied to an attack which they made

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

upon himself. In this work he took exception to the way in which they exalted Christ, to the practical depreciation or ignoring of the Father, and to the views they held about Scripture and the sacred writers. We have interesting glimpses of his personal intercourse with them, and the impression they made upon him, in his autobiography. On the occasion of a visit to his sister at Breslau, after his wife's death, he noticed that many of the awakened there went to Herrnhut, and when they came back they had learned quite a new manner of speech. Amid much that was good, he observed a very sectarian and censorious spirit in many of them. Every one else was, in their judgment, too legal. They themselves had formerly been very legal, and had insisted on holiness and following Christ, without seeing that these things can only spring from faith; and no one was earnest and holy enough for them. Now, however, that they had clearer views of the Gospel, they erred in the other extreme, and they regarded those who opposed them, as the Halle theologians did, as backsliders. Bogatzky was plunged into great perplexity by the state of matters which he found among them, but he betook himself to earnest prayer, to diligent study of the Word of God and the writings of the older teachers. This was the time when he made the additions, above referred to, to the "Golden Treasury." On another occasion, when on a visit to a friend, he was thrown among a number of noble families who had adopted Moravian views, he noticed the same spirit, and also the extreme deference which they paid to the teachers from Herrnhut—they treated them as if they were infallible,—the sensuous character of their singing, and their tendency to confound the excitement of natural feeling with the work of the Holy Spirit. Touching the whole subject, he says:—

"No one who has the truth at heart can do anything to prejudice it, nor be indifferent in the presence of what he regards as error. But no one who knows, as I have known among them, many upright souls among those who err, can treat them harshly. Many permitted themselves to be captivated by a fair appearance. Others were very harsh, and rejected everything. Both were wrong. To avoid both extremes was very difficult at that time, and called for much prayer."

Knapp, Bogatzky's friend, and the editor of his autobiography, tells us that Bogatzky became better acquainted with the state of matters among the Moravians by means of intercourse with C. von Peistel, who resided for some months in Halle in 1770. After that he expressed himself as quite at one with them on fundamental points, and acknowledged that the causes of the offence which he had taken with them in 1745 and the following years, no longer existed.

In 1740, Bogatzky went to Saalfeld, intending to stay a few weeks only, but he remained there five years. He was invited to take up his residence at the Ducal Court, which became his home till after the deaths of the Duke and Duchess. A division of opinion as to the spiritual condition of the Duchess Frederica prevailed among the pious

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

people in the place. Some of them recognised the work of God in her soul ; others stood in doubt of her. She was naturally of an anxious disposition, was constantly ill, and was plunged into great distress and temptation on the subject. She was advised to send for Bogatzky to talk with her about the state of her soul. This was the occasion of his taking up his abode at the Castle. Believing her to be the subject of a work of grace, he was enabled to speak to her in such a manner as to confirm and strengthen her. He won her confidence completely, and became, at her own desire, the companion of her daily drives. On one of these occasions they went to Greifenthal, where he held a Colloquium biblicum with the resident minister on 2 Peter i. 2 : "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you." All present were so much edified that, at the request of the Duchess, he held a similar colloquium twice a-week with the Christian gentlemen of the Court at Saalfeld, and in the presence of her husband and her lady-in-waiting. These meetings were regularly held until weakness supervening on the use of mineral waters, which was increased by much speaking, necessitated their discontinuance. At all the high festivals, and when they went to communion, he was in the habit of writing a meditation, which he read to the nobles and others who were present, giving something by way of comment in addition. Some of these meditations were published at a later period of his life. As an illustration of his work at Saalfeld, and as giving a further insight into the religious life of the Court, the case of the master of the pages may be cited, who occupied a room on the same floor as Bogatzky. He had been brought to see that an outwardly virtuous life was not enough, and to know his sinful state, by the faithful preaching which he heard when he came to Saalfeld, and by the bright example of the Christian gentlemen of the Court. He became very anxious about his soul, and opened his mind to Bogatzky, who was the means of bringing him to the enjoyment of some measure of peace.

On one occasion, however, when they were going to communion on the day of preparation, he relapsed into a state of extreme anxiety, and his distress became greater on the day when they went to confession. He came to Bogatzky declaring that all was over with him ; that he believed nothing ; that confession and communion,—indeed Christianity altogether, was nothing better than a comedy to him. Bogatzky had unwonted joy in comforting him, and assured him that the Lord would soon help him, and advised him not to stay away from communion, for it was intended for just such as he was, that they might be strengthened. Handschuh, for such was the name of the master of the pages, was soon delivered from his distress and temptation. On the very day when they went to communion he obtained assurance of forgiveness, and was filled with joy in believing. He subsequently entered the ministry, preached with much acceptance at home, and finally emigrated to America, where he laboured with great success in Pennsylvania.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

The question of assurance and the forgiveness of sins was raised at the Court by a preacher, who insisted that no one who was destitute of assurance could be a child of God. Another preacher held that such persons might be children of God, but ought not to be told that they were. Bogatzky could not accept this explanation. He thought that penitent but timid souls should be encouraged and comforted; he saw clearly the mischievous consequences of insisting too strongly on assurance; he objected to unduly pressing or hurrying souls; he recognised the fact that there is a sense in which every doctrine has its season. His words on this subject are worthy of being pondered by many zealous evangelists in our own day—

“A merely legal urgency is certainly not the part of a wise and faithful teacher, but a premature and unseasonable evangelism may also do harm, and betray people who are naturally light-minded into security. I have known many instances of this. Many teachers are only anxious that souls should rejoice at once, and not feel any anxiety. Many indeed warn people against all such anxiety. Many a soul would indeed be the better of having an anxious, broken heart for a time, in order that in its anxiety the carnal mind might become better known and be mortified, also that the heart might be made more desirous of true Divine consolation, and that such consolation might be rightly used. The misuse of the law may keep a man from real, evangelical Christianity, and do him harm, but the misuse of the Gospel is more injurious, for it engenders security and levity, and leads to outbreaks of the flesh whereas the misuse of the law tends rather to hold the flesh in check.”

After the death of the Duke and Duchess of Saalfeld, Bogatzky went to reside in the Orphan House at Halle. He took up his abode in it in 1746, and lived there till his death in 1774. In the year of his settlement in Halle a great awakening took place among the pupils of the Latin School. There were more than a hundred inquirers. They came to Bogatzky singly, or several together, for instruction and comfort. He held a preparatory meeting for them at communion seasons and on Sundays. These meetings led him to write his “*Little Treasury for the Young*.” He held also, by request, from the beginning of his residence in Halle, a meeting, attended at first by young noblemen and law students only, but afterwards almost exclusively by theological students. The meeting was held on Fridays, and continued till 1767 without any intermission, save when Bogatzky was absent from home, or ill. His method of conducting it was first to have a conversation on a chapter of the Bible, in which many took part. Then he selected the texts for the day from the “*Golden Treasury*,” let some one present state the chief propositions in them, and then added something himself. Then the meeting was closed with prayer. Many of the speakers took up too much time, and left none for Bogatzky to add a word. He reverted in consequence to the plan of a *Colloquium biblicum*, opened with prayer himself, spoke on the text for the day, and then called on some one to say something. He himself spoke again in elucidation of what had been said by the speakers whom he had invited to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

address them, and if there was time he called on others to speak, saying something himself after each speaker. In this way four or five persons sometimes took part. If, as was sometimes the case, a strange minister were present, he asked him to give the whole exposition.

This meeting always caused Bogatzky the greatest anxiety, but he prayed that he might neither do harm nor take harm.

"When I was younger," he wrote, "I could deliver an address without fear, nay with joy, but the older I grow the more fear and anxiety do I feel. I hear that this has been the experience of many servants of God who have finished their course. The Lord will stand by me in view of this exercise, and over-rule it for good."

The attendance steadily increased, till the room was quite full. At length the time came when failing memory on his part, declining attendance on the part of students, and the establishment of other meetings of the same kind, which he recommended those who came to him to attend, caused him to give up his own.

He survived this meeting between six and seven years. His literary activity, which during his life at the Orphan House in Halle had been very great, did not cease with the abandonment of his work as a lay-preacher and teacher; but he did not do much more after that.

It is beyond the scope of this article to enter into any examination or estimate of his writings. Some of them still live, and are from time to time republished in Germany, as well as his "Golden Treasury." All of them were written from the heart, and addressed to the heart, and exercised a wide-spread influence in his own day. Before his end they began to lose their hold of the public mind. Other influences arose and became dominant, and he felt this himself; but to the last he was surrounded by congenial and sympathetic friends. He died in faith and hope on the 15th of June, 1774, as he was approaching the completion of his eighty-fourth year, leaving an example fitted to stimulate and encourage others engaged in work similar to his own, and well worthy, in many ways, of imitation to-day.

JOHN KELLY.

Portfolio Leaves.

ZÖCKLER ON THE REFORMATION AND ON CHURCH CONFESSIONS.

THE following translations from the second half of Vol. II. of Zöckler's "Handbook of the Theological Sciences," which has just appeared, will be read with interest in connection with the celebration of the Luther festival during the present year. They afford at the same time a good illustration of the manner in which the subject is treated in this work. The first is from the pen of the editor, Professor Zöckler, and deals with

VOL. X.—NO. LVIII.

U

the period from the beginning of the Reformation to that of the Anti-Reformation (1517-1648).

MARTIN LUTHER.

"Martin Luther—among all the figures of the more recent German history the most popular, and among all the great men of Church history the only one who bears comparison with the Old Testament prophets of the magnitude of a Moses, a Samuel, or an Elijah—was born at Eisleben, on the 10th November, 1483, the son of a miner, Hans Luther, afterwards proprietor of a smelting-house at Mansfeld, and of Margaret, his wife, whose maiden name was Ziegler. Educated successively in schools at Mansfeld, Magdeburg, Eisenach, he went in 1501 to Erfurt to study the humanistic sciences, where he remained till 1505. On the 17th July of the latter year, after obtaining the degree of doctor in philosophy, he entered the Augustine monastery at Erfurt. At the earnest wish of his superior, John Staupitz, the young man received ordination to the priesthood. This was in the year 1507. Luther had already been severely exercised with spiritual conflicts, and had made great advance in theological knowledge by the study of the Fathers, particularly of Augustine. In the following year he entered upon a professorship of philosophy in the university of Wittenberg in Electoral Saxony. This university was founded by Frederick the Wise in 1502. He returned to his monastery in 1509, where he remained till 1511. In this year he made his important visit to Rome, on business concerning his order. In 1512 came his promotion to the degree of Doctor of Holy Scripture, and at the same time the beginning of his theological lectures,—from the year 1513 specially on the Psalms. In 1516 he was appointed preacher at the City Church in Wittenberg, as likewise visitor of the Augustine monastery in place of Staupitz. At that time Luther was a mystic, touched and awakened by the breath of the Gospel—a reverer of Tauler and kindred spirits, already despising Aristotle, and freely criticising many disorders of the hierarchy—but still a faithful son of his Church, highly esteeming Peter Lombard, the Master of Sentences, recommending the invocation of the Virgin, and defending the proposition that the Church cannot err.

"The first movements of the Reformation (1517-1521), called forth by the traffic in indulgences by the Dominican prior, John Tetzel, in the service of the Cardinal Archbishop and Elector, Albert of Mainz-Magdeburg, include the following principal acts:—Nailing of the Ninety-five Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg (31st October, 1517); literary passage-at-arms with Dr. John Eck, vice-chancellor of the university at Ingolstadt, and Sylvester Prierias, palace-master of the Pope, who attacked his theses; vindication of the forty philosophical and theological theses in an academic disputation at Heidelberg, April 1518, whereby a number of vigorous young champions, such as Bucer, Villicanus, Brentz, Schnepf, were won to the evangelical cause; firm adherence to the reformational foundation in the negotiations with two papal commissioners, Cardinal Cajetan at Augsburg (October, 1518), and the Chamberlain Karl von Miltiz at the castle of Altenburg (January, 1519); defence of thirteen theses against Eck at the Leipsic Disputation, 27th June to 18th July, 1519—an academic conflict waged in presence of Duke George of Saxony, of which the victory remained undecided, but one which proved an important turning point for the reformer, who was here compelled to assail the doctrine of the papal supremacy and to assert the fallibility even of General Councils. In the summer and autumn of 1520, came the publication of the polemic fly-sheet, 'To the Imperial Majesty and the Christian Nobles of the German Nation,' and that 'On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church' (doctrine of the seven sacraments), as well as that written in a milder tone 'On the Freedom of a Christian Man.' Then the burning of Leo X.'s bull, *Exurge Domine*, and of the papal decretals, 10th December, 1520. A solemn refusal of any retraction, not proved necessary on Scriptural grounds, before the Emperor Charles V. and the assembled Diet at

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Worms, 18th April, 1521. Beginning of the translation of the Bible (New Testament), during the nine months' exile at the Wartburg, which was imposed upon him, from 8th May, 1521, by the contrivance of Frederick the Wise, in order to shelter him against the consequences of the imperial edict of proscription."

Professor Zöckler devotes the next paragraph to a brief notice of the leading Humanists in their relation to the Reformation, and then returns to the progress of the Reformation itself. Among the Humanists of that day he adverts as follows to Melanchthon and others:—

PHILIP MELANCHTHON.

"Philip Melanchthon (Schwarzerd), son of a sword-cutler, and nephew of Reuchlin, born at Bretten, in the Palatinate, 16th February, 1497. At the age of thirteen years he was a student of the humaniora at Heidelberg; at the age of sixteen the editor of a Greek grammar of importance, as laying the foundations of the science; at seventeen years, as a master of arts, giving lessons at Tübingen; and thence, when barely twenty-one, called, on Reuchlin's recommendation, to the Greek professorate at Wittenberg; presently 'Preceptor Germaniae, second to Erasmus alone.' He wrought at first only indirectly, by means of philologic and philosophic lectures, as an assistant in Luther's reformatory labours, and was present only as a silent listener at the Leipsic disputation. But after Luther's exile in the Wartburg he began to act as the reformer's ally by his '*Loci Communes rerum Theologicarum*' (a work thrice printed in the year of its first appearing, 1521), which laid the foundations for German Protestant dogmatics; as likewise by vigorous literary work. Nitzsch speaks of him as 'the son of the Swabian sword-smith, who welded the metal of the faith, brought up by Luther, the son of the Saxon miner, out of the deep shaft, into weapons of offence and defence for evangelical Christendom.' Reuchlin, who in the latter part of his life stood entirely aloof from the work of the Reformation (d. 1522); Ulrich von Hutten, involved in the hare-brained quarrel and defeat of his knightly friend, Franz von Sickingen (1522-1523), and moreover morally fallen from his former position, died in Switzerland, 1523; Erasmus, until the Diet of Worms, nay, even beyond that time, judged not altogether unfavourably of Luther's warfare against the papacy and monkery,—from 1523, in consequence of Luther's unceremonious rejoinder to Henry VIII. of England, he began to exchange his former cool bearing for an openly hostile one ('Controversy on the freedom of the Will,' 1524-1526). Only those Heidelberg humanists already mentioned, and a number of other young adherents of this study, as Urban Rhegius (d. 1541); Andrew Osiander (d. 1552); Justus Jonas (Jodokus Koch), (d. 1555); John Bugenhagen (d. 1558), became faithful and firm supporters of the evangelic cause."

The next extract is from an article by Professor von Scheele of Upsala, on "The Confessions of the Christian Church." Section II. is devoted to an examination of the question of "The Significance of Church Confessions."

SIGNIFICANCE OF CHURCH CONFESSIONS.

"What significance is to be attached to Church confessions is a question on which there has been much dispute in our day. Whilst on the one hand they are often treated of only as testimonies of the Christian doctrinal conviction of a long by-gone age, they are here and there, on the other hand, placed almost on a level with the Word of God itself.

"In order to discover the truth lying midway between the two extremes, we

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

must return to the *idea of the Church*. The Church is essentially a communion of hearts in faith and in the Holy Ghost, whilst its outward marks consist in the pure evangelic doctrine and the use of the sacraments in accordance with the terms of their institution. As regards the first and *internal* side, we find the two factors mentioned, which form the deepest foundation of the Christian communion, indissolubly united and related to each other as consequence and cause. Where the Holy Ghost has found entrance into the heart, which is the centre of all the spiritual faculties of man, and has produced faith as the sun produces the light; there the Confession, which is only the embodiment of the belief, must follow with the same necessity as warmth follows light. 'I believe, therefore have I spoken,' says David in his day, and Paul repeats it. And this applies not only to the particular men, but also to the human whole; not only to the Christian individuals regarded singly, but equally so regarded from the standpoint of community. For all activity of the Holy Ghost upon earth tends to this result—namely, that gathering together the believers in Christ into a Christian fellowship, He should accomplish the same work in it which He accomplishes in the individuals; to the end that the organism, so far as possible, should occupy the same relation towards Him who is the Church's Head as the healthy individual organ occupies towards Him. (Compare Luther's exposition of the Third Article of Belief.)

"Rightly has the Confession been designated the expression of the Church's self-consciousness; and just as rightly may we say that it is the perception of the aim and object of the Church's actions. The Confession is not only the necessary result of all true Church life, but also that which is presupposed in order to be able to lead this life aright—a thing which is impossible without a generalising and systematising of that which is aimed at in the doctrine. The times in which the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church was manifested by extraordinary and miraculous operations, were those times which became the birth-hours of the confession. And, as in the case of other matters of importance, one is intent on giving greater definiteness and perpetuity to the expression of a recognised truth by reducing it to a *written* form; so, naturally, the Church had at heart the fixing in writing of that confession, which is accepted as the immediate expression of its apprehension of Divine truth, the truth which constitutes the basis of its life and of its hope of salvation.

"Let us now glance at the other and *external* side of the question. We have then to observe that the Church has at the same time the commission to be a salutary institution, by which, through the use of the means of grace, the nations are called to the discipleship of Jesus, and so far as possible made partakers of the grace obtained by Him for the whole world. From two points of view it can be shown how the Confession arises with the same free but inevitable necessity on this outward side as on that internal one; in the former case we proceed from our own standpoint of the confessing community, in the latter case from the standpoint of those that are without.

"In the first-named respect we must perceive a threefold significance. First, the *uniting*, of which the *Confessio Augustana VII.* teaches that it suffices for the unity of the Church to be one in the doctrine of the Gospel and the observance of the sacraments; secondly the *normative*, inasmuch as the Confession affords the necessary guidance for leading up the immature to Christian manhood, and those who have come to manhood to a greater maturity and growth in the life of God; finally, the *limiting*, inasmuch as it fixes the bounds within which ecclesiastical science, as such, has to move, and the basis on which, so far as it will continue in harmony with the Church, it has to build—because for every Church, alike self-knowledge and self-limitation to the peculiar grace received is indispensable. In the second of the above-mentioned respects, however,—i.e., as regards those who are without the Church, the work of the Confession is an *apologetic*, a *polemic*, and an *irenic* one. For only thus is the Church placed in a position duly and boldly to present its belief to the adversaries, as, likewise,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

while guarding against all false doctrines, to invite them to its blessings. Note-worthy, although it is true only of an indirect and inductive kind, is the *historic* proof for the necessity of Church Confessions, that no ecclesiastical community has anywhere been able to continue without them, and that the Biblical truth is ever afresh exposed to the peril of being itself sublimated, where the symbolic fence and guard thereof has been dispensed with.'

The section closes with a paragraph on "The Authority of the Confessions," because, and so far as, they agree with Holy Scripture. This section contains some pertinent remarks on the distinction between the truths themselves contained in the Confession, and the form under which they are presented. The former belongs to that which is essential and abiding, the latter belongs to that which is accidental and liable to fall away. The normative value of the Confessions must thus be limited not only by the standard of Holy Scripture, but also in accordance with the history of the age in which they are used.

M. J. E.

Notes of the Day.

BISHOP WORDSWORTH AND DR. MILLIGAN.—Bishop Wordsworth's charge, delivered to his clergy the other day at Perth, concludes with the following words :—

"I cannot conclude this address without alluding to the gratification which I have felt, and which I am sure you will all share with me, in reading, only two days ago, the letter of Professor Milligan which appears in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for the present month, under the title of 'Church Union.' Its avowed object is to advocate a unity in Scotland which shall embrace our Episcopal Church; and coming from an ex-Moderator of the Established General Assembly, and one of the most learned and most influential of living Presbyterian divines, it is to be hoped that some of you may live to see the happy effects which, under God's blessing, it is calculated to produce. In the meantime, we may well be thankful that a spirit so truly Christian, and so truly catholic, should have found expression, so able and so just, in a channel which cannot fail to convey its sentiments to leading members of the Presbyterian Churches, not only in Scotland, but throughout the world. More than this, I trust that a Scottish Church Union Committee will be formed of Presbyterians and Episcopalians combined, mostly, if not exclusively, of laymen, who will be at the pains to cause the letter to be reprinted, with Dr. Milligan's permission, and to be circulated widely among the middle and poorer classes."

We are not surprised at the enthusiastic terms in which Bishop Wordsworth refers to Dr. Milligan's letter. To a certain extent we can sympathise with him, because that letter bore in every line the impress of sincerity,—of a very real sense of the evils of disunion, and an intense desire to do anything that could be done in this age of unbelief, to place the Christian Church before the world in an attitude better fitted to promote faith in God and in Jesus Christ His Son. Having had to crowd our remarks on Dr. Milligan's letter last month into too condensed a form, we omitted to make this acknowledgment, which we

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

do now very cordially. We likewise note with pleasure the tone of Dr. Wordsworth's charge, much of which we have found instructive, especially the part where he comments on the recent tendency to exalt disproportionately the Fatherhood of God, and traces to that source the strong modern tendency to universalism.

But Dr. Wordsworth's remarks on Dr. Milligan, coupled with the strong conviction which he expresses that the three orders of clergy are of apostolic designation and must be maintained intact, show very clearly that what the Bishop looks for is practically and virtually not a combination of Episcopacy and Presbytery, but a return to prelacy on the part of the Presbyterian Church. It is on this footing that he desires union, and if Dr. Milligan is comforted by his letter, it is in this aspect that he must view it. That anything like a *bonâ fide* combination of presbytery with episcopacy is possible now, on terms that should conserve the principles of both, we cannot conceive. Archbishop Ussher's scheme of union was possible in its day, but then the Episcopal Church recognised the validity of Presbyterian orders, and manifested a much less exclusive spirit. Would the Scotch Episcopal Church recognise the validity of Presbyterian orders now? Could it even afford to do so, without destroying its own *raison d'être*? On the other hand, could the Presbyterian Church in Scotland accept the apostolic authority of the Episcopal office, and adapt itself thereto, without passing a sweeping condemnation on the Church history of three centuries, and turning all that we have been accustomed to think righteous and noble in its past history into shame?

The last wish we could have would be to raise up theoretical obstacles to any scheme of union which Christian brethren deemed practical and incumbent. But we are persuaded that in this case union would be merely surrender. Besides, when the elements of a feasible union exist, do they not show themselves in much brotherly co-operation, in the fellowship of prayer, and work, and worship; in readiness to take the same view of duty, the same view of the best way to do things for the glory of God and the advancement of His cause? What symptoms are there of such a disposition, such unity of spirit, on the part of the Episcopalians and Presbyterians of Scotland?

We very much doubt, too, whether, even if you succeeded in uniting the churches, you would really unite the higher and lower orders of the people. The aristocratic love of Episcopacy is often love for a more select, cultured, homogeneous religious society, and a recoil from what is common, coarse, vulgar. If all and sundry meet together, the aristocratic feeling will be hurt, however you may conduct the service. On the other hand, the mass of our middle and working-class do not relish that over-refinement which marks so many Episcopal churches. It is a plainer and simpler ritual that suits their taste. And in these democratic times it is not likely that the bone and sinew of our Presbyterian population will fall in love with a system which reduces to a

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

shadow the right of the people to take part in the government of the Church. With the example of the great towns of England before us, where it is admitted that the bulk of the working-classes has been lost to the Church, Scottish people will think twice, yea thrice, before they favour a system which has shown itself so little able to influence that class in England.

We have said that we honour the spirit by which Dr. Milligan is influenced, so far as it springs from painful concern for the prevalence of unbelief, and for the want of that attitude of union on the part of the Church in Scotland, which he deems to be the cause of this evil. We believe, however, that Dr. Milligan is far short of the truth in his estimate of the cause of unbelief. The unbelief of the present day is due to causes far deeper and more extensive. Survey Europe from England to Russia; survey America from Boston to California; survey Christendom itself, and even heathen lands, and the tendency to unbelief, the difficulty of believing, is found everywhere. It is found alike where Churches are divided, and where the Church is united. It is a feature of the age. How it comes to be so, is an interesting question, on which we should like much that some of our ablest men, who must be painfully familiar with the subject, would give our readers the benefit of their thoughts. It is in reality the great problem of the age. Doubtless the attitude of our churches in Scotland may be a local aggravation of the disease, but it is far from being its radical cause. It may be that in the Providence of God, it is designed in Scotland and perhaps elsewhere, to subserve some great purpose of Church union. But this will not be accomplished by hastily bringing together elements not very congenial, as the King of Prussia did some forty years ago. It will be accomplished through that sifting process that first disintegrates the unlike in order to unite the like,—that brings together all who have the same great views of truth and duty in the face of a common enemy dealing destruction all around; and that makes them feel that in such a crisis they cannot afford to have their ranks disunited, but must fight, shoulder to shoulder, for the faith once delivered to the saints.

DR. WORDSWORTH AND MR. HATCH.—It is rather amusing to contrast the extraordinary complacency of Dr. Wordsworth's tone to Dr. Milligan, with his sharp and barely civil tone to Mr. Hatch. Mr. Hatch, as our readers are aware (see *The Catholic Presbyterian*, December, 1881, pp. 456, 457), in his Bampton Lectures for 1880, laid down a theory that the organisation of the Christian Church was to a large extent the result of providential development, so that no type of Church organisation can claim a *jus divinum*. This, of course, struck at the root of any special sanction for episcopacy, beyond the fact of its having become very early the *de facto* government, and shown itself, as Mr. Hatch thinks, a necessity for the Church. In fact, Mr. Hatch, in a historical sense, is more favourable to presbytery than

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

episcopacy, admitting that presbytery was the primitive government of the Church, and episcopacy a subsequent development. All this seems to be very offensive to Dr. Wordsworth. It was, of course, a very fair subject for him to deal with in his charge, and indeed the refutation of the theory, and the vindication of episcopacy as an apostolic institution might very worthily have formed the chief topic of Dr. Wordsworth. Instead of taking this course, however, he goes out of his way to haul in Mr. Hatch parenthetically, and administer to him, in passing, a series of short and sharp slaps in the face. Mr. Hatch has replied to these, one by one, in a letter in the *Scotsman*, and we are bound to say that in our opinion he has defended himself from most of the charges of the Bishop. We do not say that he has defended his theory, but our fault with his theory is different from Bishop Wordsworth's. Our fault is, that he attaches no importance to the fact that the first government of the Church was, as a matter of fact, Presbyterian. Bishop Wordsworth's fault is that he will not see that, however the Church may have begun, the Apostles meant it to be prelatical.

But the instructive fact in this respect in this part of Bishop Wordsworth's charge is—the extreme jealousy he shows of any view that tends to disparage the status and authority of the primitive bishop. The same thing is apparent in his remarks on Bishop Lightfoot, who is in like manner hauled in for a special purpose. The Duke of Argyll had lately said that in the judgment of Dr. Lightfoot the government of the primitive Church was much more near to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church than any other. Not only has Dr. Lightfoot said this, but he has proved it elaborately in his commentary on the epistle to the Philippians. In opposition to this Dr. Wordsworth finds a morsel of comfort in a remark of Dr. Lightfoot's in a sermon preached in Glasgow, in which he refers to the threefold ministry as the completeness of the apostolic ordinance and the backbone of the Church. A vague remark in a sermon is hardly equal to an elaborate historical argument in a book, but it comforts Dr. Wordsworth greatly. And it shows us how tenaciously he clings to the idea of the Episcopate as an essential and indefeasible ordinance of the Church: and how vain it is to imagine that he would agree to any process of union under which that fundamental office should be either abolished or compromised. We need not say that we shall watch this whole subject with the deepest interest.

THE WALDENSIAN PASTORS' FUND.—Attached to the present number of *The Catholic Presbyterian* will be found a financial statement respecting this fund. It will be remembered that what the Continental Committee of the General Presbyterian Alliance undertook was to raise a capital sum of £12,000, the interest of which should be applied to augment the very small stipends of the pastors and professors in the original Valley charges. It appears that not only has this been done, but that a sum of £1446, 10s. 5d. has been added, the interest

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

of which, it is arranged, is to be applied to increase the very small allowances of pastors and professors retired from office. With regard to the sources from which the fund has been derived, an analysis of the contributions yields the following results:—

1. Scotland,	£6667	11	0	
Bazaar in Edinburgh,	2250	6	5	
				£8917 17 5
2. England,				1409 11 1
3. Ireland,				687 16 8
4. United States,				2012 17 6
5. British Colonies, viz.,—				
Canada,	£227	7	3	
Victoria,	75	0	0	
N. S. Wales,	12	0	0	
S. Africa Reformed Dutch Ch.,	438	17	11	
				763 5 2
6. Continent of Europe,	£104	2	0	
South America,	2	10	0	
				106 12 0
				£13,897 19 10

After adding bank interest, and deducting expenses, the net sum is, as already stated, £13,446, 10s. 5d.

This is no small achievement for an Alliance which has no working staff, and for a Committee that had to create its own machinery. It is an outstanding fact, which will be handy for reference when the usefulness of the Alliance is called in question. Yet this piece of work is of quite secondary character, for if the Alliance were not helpful in promoting spiritual fellowship among the Churches, and encouraging them to increased efforts in the good cause, it would exist comparatively in vain.

The movement for the Waldensian Church being thus completed, that for the Reformed Church in Bohemia will have a clear course for some time to come. In our next number we hope to present a statement as to the way in which it is proposed to carry out this movement.

American Notes.

DEATH OF DR. KNOX.—That Dr. Knox, of Belfast, had been ill—so ill as to cause anxiety—was known to but a small circle on this side of the Atlantic. The telegraphic announcement of his death was therefore all the greater shock to his friends here. Of all those interested in the Presbyterian Alliance none had gathered to himself more esteem and affection than the warm-hearted pastor of Linen Hall

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Street church in Belfast. He was one of the earliest promoters of the movement, having induced the Irish Presbyterian Church to express itself favourably in the matter so far back as 1873; and at the informal meeting held in New York during that year, pressed the formation of our present Alliance. In the London Conference of 1875 he took an active part, and rejoiced in the success of his labours, when he saw the Edinburgh Council of 1877. At the Council in Philadelphia he read a paper on a topic that ever lay near his heart—"The Evangelisation of Ireland"; and led the Council to decide on holding its next meeting in his own city of Belfast in 1884. For this he had been making most careful preparation, so that our next assembling might be one of the most profitable and practical hitherto held. His activity, his geniality, his willingness to fill any gap or to share any burden, his deep conviction that, under God, the work of the Alliance in bringing the scattered and divided branches of the Reformed Church into true brotherly agreement with each other, is one of the special duties of the Church in this nineteenth century, his enthusiasm communicating itself to all around him, his manifest intention of standing by the ship through all weathers—these and many similar considerations deepen one's sense of the loss the Alliance has sustained in the removal of our beloved brother. It is not, indeed, the first time in our short history that those who had been selected by their brethren for special work, have been called away in the midst of their labours. Already we have had to mourn the loss of some of our earliest fellow-labourers—Duff, Adams, Beadle, Boardman, and Knox. Yet the work has gone forward, because, as we believe, it is of God. In the present case we expect that we shall again witness the truth of the old saying that "God buries His workers, but carries on His work."

ALLIANCE WORK.—Co-operation in conducting missions among the heathen was one of the important matters considered at the Philadelphia Council. In response to the suggestions then made, the General Assembly of the (Southern) Presbyterian Church, at its late session, adopted the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly empower the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions to conduct such correspondence with missionaries, and mission committees, and boards as may be necessary, to ascertain if it be desirable for us, and if so, the best practicable method of carrying out the scheme of co-operation between the missionaries of the 'Reformed Churches' in the foreign field suggested by the Pan-Presbyterian Council, and report to next Assembly."

In connection with this matter of mission co-operation, a somewhat curious complication has arisen in the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1872, the Synod of the Maritime Provinces, at that time an independent Church, but since then merged in the Canada Presbyterian Church, authorised its missionaries in Trinidad to form, along with the missionaries of other Presbyterian Churches labouring in the same field,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

a Presbytery. In 1880, the General Assembly of the Canada Church passed a resolution approving of the training of a native agency in Trinidad, sanctioned the course of study prescribed by the Presbytery there, and authorised this united Presbytery to proceed to the licensure and ordination of any native candidates for the ministry whom they might accept. In 1882, the Assembly, forgetful of what it had done in 1880, directed ministers engaged in missionary work, and whose names did not appear on the lists of any home Presbytery, to connect themselves with the Presbyteries within whose bounds they had resided before going to the foreign field. A newspaper brought the report of this action of the Assembly to Trinidad, just as the Presbytery there was about to ordain a native student to the ministry. The Presbytery fell back on the earlier action of the Assembly, agreed to ask the Assembly to exempt it from the operation of the resolution of 1882, proceeded with the ordination, and decided to continue its course until the Assembly should be fully heard from. The matter was apparently overlooked by the Assembly of 1883, so that this action of the Trinidad Presbytery may be considered as accepted by the Church. Here, then, we have a Mission Presbytery, not connected ecclesiastically with any existing Church, exercising all the powers of a Presbytery; and thus, evidently, the foundation has been laid for the existence of an independent native self-governing Church, one that is even now engaged in raising up a native ministry. The members of this Presbytery receive their support, it is true, from a source outside their congregations; but while hitherto they have had no presbyterial connection, and were simply the agents and servants of a mission committee, engaged and dismissed by this committee at its pleasure, subject only to the supervision of a General Assembly, they have now a presbyterial connection, are responsible to a Presbytery for their conduct as ministers of the Gospel, and are able, in an orderly manner, to discharge presbyterial duties. Of course, the Presbytery, even in so extreme a case as discipline, can only remove the names of offenders from its roll, and refuse to "fellowship" them any longer,—an act which in no way binds the Mission Committee at home, nor affects necessarily the standing of the suspended individuals in their mother Churches. Some of our Presbyterian Churches do not place, I believe, the names of their missionaries on the rolls of home Presbyteries, nor form them into local Presbyteries. In such cases, the way seems very clear for the formation of Presbyteries, for ecclesiastical purposes, by brethren connected with different home Churches, and thus there can easily be planted the germ of a native Church. Other Churches, at the earliest date, form their missionaries into local Presbyteries, and thus obtain on foreign ground a Presbytery that is a constituent part of the home Church. Of course, in such cases there can be no complications like the one just mentioned; but neither can there be any special approach toward the formation of native Churches except as connected with some of the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

home Churches, and so reproducing all the peculiarities of such,—a step carefully to be avoided.

The question of these united Presbyteries may, probably, come in some form before the next meeting of the Alliance, for as is well known, there exists a most efficient one in Amoy, where the English Presbyterian Church agents co-operate with the missionaries of the American (Dutch) Reformed Church, while again in Japan the missionaries of the Northern Presbyterian Church of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, and of the Scottish United Presbyterian Church, co-operate with much comfort to each other, and with a happy exhibition to the heathen of the real unity of the Christian Church.

In connection with this question of foreign missions, may not the Alliance be at liberty to say something about the encroaching by one branch of the Church on what may be recognised as the field peculiarly of another? As is well known, Egypt and the valley of the Nile have been occupied exclusively by the agents of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States. A great deal of money has been expended, and the results have been most gratifying. A presbytery has been formed, half of whose members are of native origin, while the Church has just been offered a large sum of money in aid of mission work still farther up the Nile, with a view, in fact, to entering into the very heart of Africa. The work is carried on chiefly among the Copts. Now it is announced that the Episcopal Church of England is about to commence a mission within the same territory. "The field is the world," and while every Christian heart must rejoice when Christian people seek its occupation, in view of the limited resources available for the work, one must ask, Can the Episcopal Church of England find no unoccupied place in all heathendom, where it may go and "preach the Gospel" to the perishing, without taking a step that must to some extent hinder a work at present going forward? The same inquiry may be asked in reference to the recent action of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in reference to the (Dutch) Reformed Church in Madras. It seems that in 1855, on the repeated solicitation of Bishop Dealtry of the Madras Diocesan Committee, the Reformed Church purchased from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel all its property at Vellore, on, of course, the distinct understanding that the Society withdrew from the field, and pledged itself not to re-enter it so long as efficiently manned. For twenty-five years the S.P.G. kept the agreement, but in 1880 the agents of the Diocesan Committee did re-enter the field, and that in a most regrettable manner, hiring a building right across the street beside the mission premises of the Reformed Church, while its agents, it is charged, have sought to lessen the influence of the Reformed missionaries by publicly representing them as "schismatics" and "heretics." Representations have already been made to the Diocesan Committee as to their breach of faith, and on the unchristian conduct of their agents, but as yet to no purpose. Now, as to a court of last resort, the Reformed

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Church has made its appeal to the S.P.G. direct, in the hope of securing a disavowal by it of the conduct of its agents in India.

These are painful facts. Denominational feeling does sometimes get the better of Christian brotherhood, and leads to actions that should never take place. But since such things do occur, would it be out of place, for the Alliance to join the Churches whose workings have been interfered with in their representations to the alleged offenders, and thus to strengthen their hands as they seek a rectification of what may not have been intended? The "Distribution of Mission Work" is specified in the constitution of the Alliance as one of the matters with which it might concern itself; Is it not called on, then, to show its sympathy with the brethren who complain? Such a movement would either secure the support of men like Canon Butler, who at the recent meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury opposed the recognition by the Church of England of Bishop Riley and others in Spain, as lawfully there, or lead to a yet more distinct avowal that the opposition to Bishop Riley was purely in the interests of the existing Romish Church in that country.

PRESBYTERIAN AND METHODIST UNION.—Not a hopeful prospect, one may readily say, when such a subject is announced, and yet the questions have been started, "Is such a union desirable? Is it impracticable?" At first sight, the gulf between the two Churches seems very wide; but, How wide is it? Is it *very* wide? So far as polity is concerned, the difference is, perhaps, not so great as may be thought. Every year the Methodist Church is being leavened with Presbyterian ideas, though Methodist names may be kept up. If Methodism has its "Bishops," there was a time when Presbytery also had bishops, and the officer that we can hardly dispense with in our Home Mission work in this country, but whom we call "Synodical Missionary," has such a likeness to the Bishop of Methodism, that he would need only part of a new suit of clothes to allow of his being regarded as a "bishop in good and regular standing."

Local preachers and class leaders are simply Presbyterian elders with a good deal more life in them than is always found in our elders. With a very little rearranging of "Circuits," and "Districts," and "Presbyteries," the most pronounced Methodist or Presbyterian might be utterly unable to say to which of these local classifications he belonged. So that as far as polity is concerned, there is no inseparable bar to co-operation. But "Presbyterian" means something more than a polity. It is a system of doctrine as well as a form of government. The Unitarians of England have always retained the name Presbyterian; and during the dark days when Arianism was rife in the north of Ireland, the Presbyterian polity was retained, and the Presbyterian name used, as it is to this day, by the Remonstrant Presbytery. We would need to be agreed in doctrine, therefore, before we could talk of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

union, or have much co-operation with the Methodists. Now, Presbyterians are Calvinists—Calvinists of many shades and types,—while the Methodists are Arminians confessedly; but Arminians, as a rule, of a distinctly evangelical type. Fifty years hence there may be some "Plan of Union" existing between the two denominations, by which they may be more helpful to each other than at present; but at present they have this at least, but most notably, in common, a clear apprehension of the spiritual nature of true religion. Each believes in a faith of a supernatural origin, leading to a spiritual union between the sinner and a Divine Saviour, by whom again satisfaction was made in the sacrifice of the cross for the sins of men, and that that saving faith works by love. Each rejects as unscriptural any and every form of a religion that lays stress on externals and forms, believing that "a man must be born again before he can see the kingdom of God." Spiritual affinities are deeper and stronger than any of an external character, and under the influence of such, these two great Churches may yet come into closer relationship than exists to-day.

MR. BEECHER'S THEOLOGY.—There was a time when Mr. Beecher's name was one to conjure with, but that has long since passed. Nothing shows this so plainly as the complete ignoring of his utterances by both the religious and the secular press. The sceptre has passed out of his hands. People at a distance wonder, at times, how to account for this. Perhaps an extract from a letter which he lately wrote to a friend, stating his theological position, may explain the whole matter:—

"I am," says Mr. Beecher, "a cordial Christian evolutionist. I do not agree by any means with all of Spencer, his agnosticism, nor all of Huxley, Tyndall, and their school. They are agnostic. I am not, emphatically. But I am an evolutionist, and that strikes at the root of all mediæval and orthodox modern theology; the fall of man in Adam, and the inheritance by his posterity of his guilt, and by consequence, any such view of the Atonement as has been constructed to meet this fabulous disaster. Men have not fallen as a race. Men have come up. No great disaster met the race at the start. The creative decree of God was fulfilled. Any theory of the Atonement must be one which shall meet the fact that man was created at the lowest point, and, as I believe, is, as to his physical being, evolved from the animal race below him; but, as to his moral and spiritual nature, is a son of God, a new element having come in, at the great movement of evolution, at the point of man's appearance."

That explains why Mr. Beecher is dead. A Christian community will not accept such a teacher as "a man sent from God."

PROPERTY RIGHTS OF SOULS.—An interesting case came lately before the New York Law Courts as to the property rights of souls, on which a decision has been given that seems common-sense, but that has rather irritated some members of the Romish Church. Some time ago an aged and wealthy woman in New York placed in the hands of a friend a sum of money to be expended after her death in defraying funeral expenses, erecting a monument, and in paying for certain masses for

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

the good of her soul. Soon afterwards she died intestate. Her nephew, as next of kin, became administrator, and sued the person in whose hands the money had been placed for it. After considerable litigation, the following decision was lately given:—In England the leaving of money for the saying of masses would be void, on the ground of its being a superstitious disposition, but there being no established religion in the United States, such an objection would not hold. The disposition was valid, so far as the woman's having a right to do with her own what she might please. But was a trust created by so leaving the money? If so, it was not a *charitable* one, because not a public, but a personal, gain was sought. Neither was it a "pious use," such a use being unknown in the States. The trust alleged to have been created was, in the eye of American law, no trust whatever, and so the disposition falls, because it was neither a gift nor a disposition by last will and testament. The person to be benefited is dead, and beyond the reach of human law. She had given only verbal instructions about the masses. It is open to her, therefore, to change her mind and recall those instructions, or she might re-enact them, but her voice cannot reach this court. We have no knowledge of her present wishes. Her soul is not subject to the jurisdiction of earthly courts, which can include within their jurisdiction only the living. She cannot, therefore, be regarded by the court as having any beneficial interest in the property of which she was possessed while here, and so that must be distributed according to the laws of the State referring to the estates of persons dying intestate. The money unexpended has, therefore, to be paid over to the nephew.

THE ORGAN QUESTION IN THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—Your readers will remember that a portion of the United Presbyterian Church on this side of the ocean has been greatly exercised by the refusal of their General Assembly to affirm that the Scriptures prohibit the use in Divine worship of a musical instrument, particularly of an organ. The last Assembly having refused to reopen the question, the dissatisfied minority have just held a Convention in Allegheny, which was largely attended, and at which some very pronounced speeches were made. These brethren are drawing the lines very sharply indeed, when they put their position thus: "Either we will put the organ out, or we will ourselves go out." That is burning the bridge; for the brethren on the other side are just as clear that they cannot say that the Scriptures teach what they do not believe they teach. The anti-organists include many men of very strong convictions, who, if they considered it their duty, would walk right down the crater of Vesuvius without a moment's hesitation. Whether the other side will show as much grit remains to be seen; but, certainly, it looks as if there would be some not very edifying agitation before that Church during the coming winter. The struggle is intensified by the fact that, in case of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

a split, the whole property of the Church would remain with the majority, and that while the organists might be perfectly willing to let the antis have their fair share, if that would secure peace, they have no security that a similar offer would be extended to them.

OBITUARY.—If the opening lines of this letter refer to the loss of the Irish Church, and the loss of the Alliance, by the removal of Dr. Knox, my closing ones must mention the loss of the American Church, and again of the Alliance, by the unexpected death, from typhoid fever, of the Rev. Dr. S. J. Wilson, Professor of Church History at Allegheny. Dr. Wilson was in the full maturity of his powers, and abundant in labours, when he has been called up higher. A diligent student, a successful teacher, a popular preacher, an influential churchman, the Assembly had elected him to the Moderatorship nearly ten years ago, thus recognising the peculiar combination of his gifts. Like Dr. Knox, he took part in the formation of the Alliance in London in 1875, was present at our Philadelphia Council, reading them a paper that contained a striking theory of Presbyterianism, and had been appointed by the General Assembly to attend the Belfast Council as one of its delegates. He has, however, been called to a larger and loftier Assembly, where he is in the midst of brethren with whom he was a co-worker during his sojourn on earth. "Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth ; for the faithful fall from among the children of men."

G. D. MATHEWS.

General Survey.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF SCOTLAND.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN THE COLONIES.—It is encouraging to find that in Australia, as indeed in all the British colonies, Presbyterianism holds its ground so well. The Anglican Church is, we believe, relatively more powerful in New South Wales than in any of our greater colonial settlements, but the New South Wales Presbyterians show no signs of succumbing to their strong and somewhat overbearing neighbour. They recently intimated to the sister home Churches their desire to have fifty additional clergy sent out to them, and they remitted at once money for the outfit of fifteen. They promise to outcomers, of course sufficiently certificated, £200 a-year for two years after their arrival, that they may have time and opportunity of becoming known to, and making arrangements with, the needing congregations. The Church of England, we may notice, is paying great attention to the colonies at present. The clergy are being pressed to let no emigrants leave their

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

parishes without letters of commendation to colonial ministers. Agents wait the arrival of emigrant ships in colonial ports, and by intimating a Church of England service, pick out their people and send them to their proposed destination with directions and introductions. In some cases, if we are not mistaken, "Handbooks for Church Emigrants" are circulated, no doubt sometimes falling into Presbyterian hands. Besides, some first-rate men are being given to the colonies by the English Church. Canon Barry, who stands high both in the Church and the universities, and who might probably have counted on a home see, has been nominated for an Australian bishopric; and very recently the Hon. and Rev. Canon Anson gave up the rectorship of Woolwich, with its ample stipend, to devote himself to Church mission-work among the settlers in Manitoba. The British, Colonial, and American Presbyterians, would do well to look carefully to their people there.

ORDINATION OF ASSISTANTS TO PARISH MINISTERS.—The proposal to have the assistants of parish ministers ordained is exciting some interest, it would appear, in the Established Church. It is about to come before its Home Mission Committee. The question is important theologically as well as practically. The Scotch Church has always looked askance on what is called the *vagum ministerium*, and unless in very exceptional cases has shrunk from ordaining save on a call of the congregation. Even in the darkest period of the persecution, when ministers were greatly needed to carry on God's work, the suffering clergy were very doubtful of doing without a call, which sometimes, however, was given in the very fires. The subject was fully discussed at that time. Some thought that in the altogether peculiar condition of the Church the general rule might be broken; but there seems to have been such opposition, and that by calm and competent men, that the matter apparently was dropped. The same view was taken by the early seceders. In the course of last century, persons who did not leave the Established Church, were sometimes in great difficulties when the minister of the parish had been intruded without the call of the people, as they did not think he had any right to baptise their children; and the "called" minister could only help at his peril, though he did it sometimes on the sly, no doubt with the hope of condonation from his slighted neighbour.

GENTRY AT EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION.—At the recent consecration of the Bishop of Argyle and the Isles, at Fort-William, we are told that "all the gentry of the district were present." It is an indication, not to be mistaken, of the ecclesiastical tendencies and tastes of the Scotch landed proprietors. It shows whither they are going or have gone. It is in many ways to be regretted. All classes must suffer when the higher classes sever themselves from the prevailing religion of a country, —and not least, the aristocratic seceders. The severance almost inevitably goes further—has it not gone pretty far already in Scotland? We

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

fear there is not much prospect of the old state of things quickly returning. We were greatly struck by a paper read a year or two ago, at a Church Congress we think, by the Bishop of Bedford, one of the best and wisest of the High Church prelates. It was on the increasing absence of the English peasantry from "Church;" and one reason he gave for that was, that the "*carriage folk*" went there. Is Dr. Milligan sure that the presence of the gentry in the Scotch parish kirks, desirable as that is, would attract the people? Nor can we think that liturgic worship is likely to do much in that way. It has proved a great failure among the masses in England, as thoughtful Episcopalians are now ready to admit. The truth is, that it is not easy to have a type of worship which is equally adapted to all stages and types of culture,—though a simple and unadorned one, so far as the truly devout are concerned, is certainly that to which *all* can most *easily* adapt themselves. Besides, it seems as if the spread of political liberty had some tendency, for the time, to strengthen or develop social jealousies. This is just one of the difficulties which the very success of Christianity creates.

MISSION-DEATHS IN AFRICA.—It is at a terrible cost of precious human lives that African missions are carried on. The last news tells again of death. Two of the female agents of the Mission at Blantyre have fallen. From Livingstonia the intelligence is more cheering. The London Missionary steam-launch has got to the head of Lake Nyassa. It reached there on the Queen's last birthday, and by this time may be across to Tanganyika. The Church Missionary Society, we hope, will follow suit and soon have a steamer on the Albert Nyanza. Dr. Laws has finished the translation of the New Testament into the Chinyanja language,—a notable event, both in a literary and scientific point of view; and it may be an important one in the religious and political history of the country. One of the Nyanza missionaries writes, that if the New Testament were translated into Ruganda, he believes that Mtesa would be so proud of the achievement, that he would issue an order compelling every man in his kingdom to learn to read it. Perhaps there is not intelligence enough for such an act of despotism among the Nyassa tribes.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.—The chief recent event in connection with the Church of England is the publication of the Report of the Royal Commission on Church Courts. It is, in many respects, a very perplexing document.

There are to be three Courts according to the plan suggested. 1. There is the Diocesan, in which, in cases of heresy or of ritual offence, the bishop sits with a legal assessor (his chancellor) and a theological assessor, whom he selects "with the *advice* of the dean and chapter." In this court the case commences. 2. There is the Provincial Court,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

to which appeal may be taken from the Diocesan. Here the whole work may be done by the "official principal," a lawyer of ten years' practice appointed by the archbishop of the province (an archbishop's Lord Penzance). If, however, the archbishop wish to have his own hand in the matter, he may preside himself in the Court with his "official principal" as legal assessor—and if he think fit, with not more than five bishops, or five theological professors, of whom he makes choice, as theological assessors. 3. If the Court of the Archbishop does not satisfy the parties, the case may be carried before a court of laymen learned in the law, and appointed, not by an archbishop, but by the Crown. Instead of one Lord Penzance at the beginning, the Church is to get five Lord Penzances at the close. These new lay judges, of whom apparently there are to be eight or ten, must declare themselves members of the Church of England. They are to act in rotation, five at a time, at the summons of the Lord Chancellor. With them remains the final decision; but any *one* of them may require, by "answers to specific questions," from the whole bishops of the Church, "*evidence* as to the doctrine or views of the Church of England on questions before them." Their decision being given, the Crown issues its order to the Bishops' Court to deprive, or depose, or excommunicate.

Without attempting to criticise this extraordinary report—and it is open to criticism at every point—we notice one or two things in it:— 1. It is by way of being very ecclesiastical with its Diocesan and Provincial Courts, to please the High Church. It ends with an Appeal Court of laymen, to satisfy the Evangelicals. But is it, in fact, anything more in principle and form than the old Erastianism, with some new, and, it may be, more penetrative varnish on it? 2. Under the new system, as under the old, an ecclesiastical process must be a long and cumbrous affair. Only a powerful association or the very rich can ever think of facing the expense. Things are made still worse in this respect by the proposal that henceforth no sort of authority is to be attached to the "reasonings" of judges in delivering their opinions either in the past or in the future, and so a new uncertainty will attach to every ecclesiastical case. 3. The power of a "single" judge to demand the calling of the bishops to give their counsel is very singular.

But we must stay our pen. The whole vast structure is, after all, little better than a castle in the air. The real pith of the report lies in the proposed veto with which the bishop is to be endowed. No heresy, no divergence from the authorised ritual, no immorality can come before a court ecclesiastical, save at his pleasure. He is only required to state his reasons for doing so to the complainant, and place a copy of them in the Diocesan Registry; and however vague or invalid they may be, there is no redress. As to getting up public feeling,—everybody knows how difficult that is in matters of merely local knowledge and interest. Besides, the power and influence of a bishop in a diocese are immense. The clergy who might be disposed to make a stir, never like to offend

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1888.]

"his lordship," with his vast social influence and, what is even more serious, his great patronage—the English bishops have livings worth a million a-year in their gift, and not a few of these very valuable.

J.

I R E L A N D.

THE LATE ROBERT KNOX, D.D.

ON 16th of August last, Dr. Knox, of Belfast, entered into his eternal home. For more than three months he had been suffering from disease of the heart, under which he gradually sank. But though often tried by paroxysms of severe pain, his faith and hope were steadfast unto the end. He passed away in the full assurance, through the rich grace of Christ as his all in all, of an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom.

To the readers of this Journal Dr. Knox was not a stranger. From the first movement towards the formation of the General Council of the Presbyterian Churches, he manifested a deep and growing interest in this effort to bind together the different members of the vast family. The cause of Christian union and co-operation in the work of the Lord lay very near to his heart. With great enthusiasm he entered into the business of the first meeting of the Council in Edinburgh. Joined by several brethren from the Irish Presbyterian Church he attended as a delegate in Philadelphia and took part in the proceedings. It was, we have reason to believe, largely owing to the cordiality with which he supported the invitation, that it was arranged that the next meeting of the Council should be held in Belfast next year. Into the preparations for that meeting our departed brother had heartily entered.

Time after time he summoned the Committee, and as long as he had physical powers—ay, and beyond his powers—he was present to counsel and stimulate others. Earnestly did he desire that he might be permitted to accomplish this work. But the Master had ordered otherwise. Meekly he bowed to His holy will, fully assured that "He doeth all things well."

Robert Knox was born in 1816, in a quiet Ulster home. For more than forty years his father filled the office of ruling elder in a Presbyterian Church. At the early age of eight years Robert was brought to "know the Lord." His heart was set upon a ministry of the Gospel. His father, dreading the Socinian influence which at that time more or less prevailed in the institution at Belfast, sent his son to Glasgow. The collegiate course was all but completed there—a few classes in Belfast supplementing the college curriculum.

In 1840, Robert Knox was licensed by the Presbytery of Strabane. For about a year he was sent on mission-work to the South of Ireland, and was then called to the pastorate of New Row Church, Coleraine.

In less than two years the young minister received an invitation to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Linen Hall Street Church, Belfast. There he laboured for over forty years. During all these years Dr. Knox proved himself an able, zealous, and faithful minister of Jesus Christ. No uncertain sound was heard from the pulpit of that church he so long occupied. Christ was the grand theme of his preaching. With great power and unction did he hold forth the full and free salvation of the Gospel. From the year 1859, especially a year of great awakening in many parts of Ulster, the ministry of Dr. Knox appeared to be greatly blessed. He has left behind him a congregation in which great life and freshness prevail in almost all departments of congregational service, especially in evangelistic work.

In the various enterprises and councils of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Dr. Knox will be much missed. He possessed a singularly sound judgment, and great administrative power. Belfast owes much to our departed brother. In the efforts for Church extension he took a leading part. Several school buildings for the poor and operative classes were erected through his influence and unwearied efforts. For many years he filled the post of Secretary to the Belfast Town Mission, and did much to extend the operations of this Society, not only by his vigorous and earnest appeals at each annual meeting on behalf of the lapsed masses, but by his continuous oversight of this important enterprise. But his work is done, and the Lord has called His servant home.

During his last illness Dr. Knox dwelt with special interest on several portions of that Word which has through long ages been the comfort and the stay of God's children. Among these were the well-known texts:—"Redeemed with the precious blood of Christ;" "The Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me;" "Accepted in the Beloved;" "Complete in Him;" "Now unto Him who is able to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy;" "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." Often might he be heard engaged in almost inaudible prayer or in repeating that hymn,—

"O Christ, what burdens bowed Thy head!
Our load was laid on Thee;
Thou stoodest in the sinner's stead,
Didst bear my sin for me;
A victim led, Thy blood was shed,
Now there's no load for me."

BELFAST.

GEORGE SHAW.

GERMANY.

THE SUNDAY QUESTION IN GERMANY.

By FREDERIC H. BRANDES, D.D.

For some time past, the Sunday question has caused much discussing and quarrelling in Germany. The Chief-President of the Prussian province of Saxony, Baron Wolff, published in the beginning of this year an order enjoining the people to keep Sunday more care-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

fully than they had done hitherto. Such labours as would not be pressing should be postponed to the following week-days; especially shops should be closed on Sundays during a certain part of the day; noisy pleasures should be no longer allowed, &c. But a great multitude of citizens felt injured and compelled to oppose, especially inn and shop keepers, manufacturers, tradespeople of every kind; in short, all who had been accustomed to neglect Sunday altogether, and to employ the day of rest for their worldly business or pleasures as they did every other day of the week. Protests were drawn up and sent to the authorities at Berlin, and even some of the courts of justice of the province declared the order of the President to be invalid. Let us hope that the authorities at Berlin will not disavow the order of the President.

Moreover, the German parliament made this question a subject of debate, when the budget of the Postmaster-General of the Empire was proposed. Mr. Lingen, a member of the diet, availed himself of this occasion to make a motion to release the under class of post-officers from being occupied throughout every Sunday. Mr. Lingen proposed that their work should be reduced as much as possible on Sunday; the indispensable alone should be done; and that only letters and cards, but no parcels, should thereafter be delivered on the Sabbath. The hours of work the mover wished to be diminished; and especially that during the hours of service no work should be done in the post-offices. Mr. Lingen called it a duty and a necessity to grant also the postmen time to take care for the eternal welfare of their souls; and we cannot deny that he did not demand anything more than what might be reasonably desired. However, opposition was made in the most passionate manner.

All who were interested in religion and Church matters—for instance, Mr. Stöcker, one of the chaplains of the King of Prussia, as well as Dr. Windhorst, the chief champion of the popish party in Germany—did not hesitate to defend the motion as seriously as possible. But the members of the left side of the house, above all, the “Progress-faction,” contested it with the utmost violence. And what they did not fail to conjure also on this occasion was the usual spectre they take refuge in when the question is one of Sunday-keeping: the so-called “Puritan Sunday” of England. “We are not willing,” they protested, “to admit anything so horrible as the Puritan Sunday of England;” and then they made efforts to paint the English custom in the darkest colours, Mr. Stephan, the Postmaster-General, joining them by stating that the condition of his officers was not at all an overburdened one. No agreement was come to. The maintainers of the motion, to be sure, did not admit the validity of the objections of the other side. They charged them with exaggeration, showing that the Sunday in England and Scotland was by no means so distasteful as the opponents would make us believe. Even Dr. Windhorst could not help rejecting the reproaches uttered against the conscientious manner of our neighbours

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

on the other side of the channel. But they were not successful in convincing their opponents. "Our people," the latter said, "do not care for these outward things, which it is the interest of the clergy to favour, and we will not bear the burden." They ventured to represent it as the very essence of freedom, not to allow a motion to pass which had no other intention than to give freedom to a large portion of our people on Sunday.

But they did not consider that they, of course, were laying a heavy burden on the shoulders of the postmen; and as little did they seem to understand that the "freedom" which they felt compelled to defend against the "tyrannical desires of the clergy," by rejecting any motion whose object is to make people keep Sunday, is but the freedom of the rich and of those who, because of their riches, are independent. For the lower classes of our nation, especially for the servants in our towns, Sunday, the day of pleasure for their masters, is a day of hard work, as the servants must prepare the Sunday dinner-parties and other pleasures for their masters, and attend the latter at their amusements. Of course Sunday, kept as it ought to be, would afford a less bright and brilliant feature to all who are in the favourable condition of making it a day of joy and amusement for themselves; but whether it would not really be a day of freedom and repose to the large class which is not in such a favourable situation as to lay the burden of life on the neck of their fellow-creatures, that, I should think, is quite another question. And what kind of freedom is that which those men will establish who say, "We neither like nor desire to attend the church services as regards ourselves, and therefore we will not afford those of our countrymen who feel this want according to their religious convictions the possibility of satisfying it." Are these men entitled to speak at all of "tyranny," and to impeach the clergy for hindering it?

Mr. Lingen's motion was rejected, but not by a majority. The number of votes was equal on both sides (103—103), and, provided our reporters tell the truth, if the Rev. Mr. Stöcker had not been absent from the session when the voting was going on, it would have been in his power to decide the question in favour of his own side. It was at an evening session when our representatives were asked to give their votes concerning this matter, and unfortunately Mr. Stöcker had to deliver a speech at a meeting of one of his Christian-social clubs at the same hour. For this reason he had to neglect the cause which he had defended in the morning with the utmost eagerness. But, however that may be, what is postponed is not yet given up, and on the next occasion the friends of a Christian Sunday will, let us hope, rejoice in a majority. The persuasion that the Sunday question is of great importance in regard to the moral and spiritual welfare of our people, gains more and more support, though we cannot conceal that those who have an interest in the present state of the matter make great efforts to frustrate the endeavours of their opponents. From

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

different parts of the country protests against the motion of Mr. Lingen and his friends are just now drawn up to be sent to the parliament, subscribed by all kinds of tradespeople, and suggesting that it would be a great blow to the commerce of Germany if the postmen should be allowed to keep Sunday as Christians should do.

ITALY.

By Rev. A. MEILLE.

WALDENSIAN SYNOD AT TORRE-PELLICE (LA TOUR).

OUR Waldensian Synod is just over, and I hasten to send a few notes upon it for the next number of the *Catholic Presbyterian*. It was opened at Torre-Pellice on Monday, 3rd September, at 2 P.M., by an excellent sermon of Pastor Hugon of Rorà, on John xv. 4, 5. Then came the ordination of three young ministers, who had been previously examined by the company of pastors—Messrs. F. Rostagno, evangelist in Milan; E. Vinay, evangelist in Sicily; and A. Comba, of whom more anon. Our ordination service is very simple, but very earnest and impressive, and I have very seldom seen the large church of La Tour so crowded as it was on that day.

The first subject taken up by the Synod of this year was the administration of the Table, beginning with a thorough examination of the state of religion within the Waldensian Valleys. There are, in this respect, things to be rejoiced at, and things to be deplored, as in all Churches. From the reports on the subject, I will especially notice first of all the fact that *all* the ministers of the Waldensian Church, without a single exception, are perfectly sound in their doctrine and in their preaching. Neighbouring Churches are unhappily torn by doctrinal strife, which seems to threaten their very existence. Thank God, it is not so with us; on the great and fundamental principles of the evangelical faith there is not one dissenting voice in all our pulpits, and that is undoubtedly a great boon, which the Waldensian Church will do well not to lose, or even to lessen in the slightest degree. Another important feature is certainly the activity of most of the ministers, not only in their preaching, but in every department of pastoral work. A Waldensian pastor's life, especially in the winter months, is a very busy one. Most of them have large and widely-scattered parishes to visit, many schools to superintend, and yet they have found time to meet repeatedly in order to prepare an excellent and popular little catechism now in general use, and a short explanation of Genesis for the schools. The attendance at church is very good generally in the Waldensian Valleys, and in many places, during the winter months, it would be difficult to find a vacant seat in the churches. Several instances were reported of a better observance of the Sunday, of a more regular reading of the Scriptures, of greater interest in the missionary enterprises of the Church. At the same time

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

it was deplored that many young people of both sexes continue to go for employment to cities like Marseilles and Nice, where there is much vice, bringing back with them sometimes the grossest infidelity and moral corruption. The war between good and evil, between Satan and Christ, is waged also in these mountain retreats of the old faith, and those that belong to the Lord were strenuously urged to come more courageously forward, to rally round their faithful ministry, and to fight the good fight of faith.

Another important subject was that of education. In the Waldensian Valleys not only each parish, but each district of the parish has its own school, at least during the winter months, so that there are scarcely any children left without some education. At the same time, it is felt necessary to raise the standard of education in two ways, by giving to the *programme* of our schools more unity, and by bettering the position of the teachers, so as to secure in future the most efficient class of men to be had. Of course neither of these things is to be done in a day, but much good may be achieved by keeping them both steadily in view.

The report on the *College of La Tour* was most satisfactory, showing in particular that our young students understand the peculiar nature of the school, which was founded to give pastors and teachers to the Church. They formed last year a *Missionary Society*, with the view of stirring up among the people an interest in missions, by giving information and collecting funds. For many years the question has been debated whether our College at La Tour was, or was not, to be *pareggiato*,—that is to say, made to adopt the programme and the rules of similar institutions belonging to the State, which would give it the right to confer degrees, and to send its students straight into the universities. But the general feeling is against such a measure, for it would entail the almost entire abandonment of the French language. Now the possession of the French language is too great a benefit for our people to give it up without very substantial reasons. Those who from Turin and Pinerolo urge us to take such a step have been aptly compared to the fox, who, having lost his tail, advised all his fellows to cut off such a useless piece of furniture. This is a kind of *pareggiamento* for which we do not feel the slightest inclination. But besides abandoning French almost entirely, we would be obliged to curtail considerably the Biblical instruction given in our College, a loss which would never be compensated by all the academical degrees in the world. I trust that the Synod will never follow the pernicious policy of the *pareggiamento*, and will for ever remain faithful to the end for which Dr. Gilly and General Beckwith gave the Waldensian Church its College.

I am happy to say, that rather than follow such a policy, we have cheerfully submitted to the loss of the annual subsidy of nearly £100, which, for the last thirty years, the Minister of Public Instruction had been giving to our College. This has brought about a heavy deficit of more than £500 on the College funds. A bazaar held during

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

the Synod time has been very successful, and will reduce that deficit by about £160. Still there will be a yearly deficiency of nearly the same sum, and it will, I am afraid, weigh heavily on the Table.

Some friends will be sorry to hear that the Synod has decided to shut for some time the Normal School attached to the College. I hasten to say that this does not at all mean that the Church will no more trouble itself with the preparation of proper schoolmasters. This would never do, for those that we could get from the State normal schools might be very clever, but would at the same time be either Romanists or infidels. Christian schoolmasters are more necessary than ever, and if we shut our normal school it is only with a view to prepare them in a different way. Young men well qualified for the work of teachers will be sent most probably to Florence, where, under the superintendence of the theological professors, they will follow the lectures of the State Normal School, take their diplomas, and come back with a much better preparation than they could ever get at La Tour. This is the beginning, and who knows what the consequences may be? Perhaps we shall see sooner than we expect the normal school started anew on the banks of the Arno.

The *Superior School for Girls* will this year enter on a new era by taking possession of new and far superior premises, built expressly for its use. The new edifice looks somewhat *bourgeois* outside, but the schoolrooms are all that could be desired for size, light, air, and convenience. This school is a most important one. It was the favourite work of General Beckwith, and it would gladden his heart if he could only see the development it has taken of late. I may say, for the benefit of your readers, that very often English and Scotch young ladies have been sent to our school for a year or two, to acquire French, and continue their education. La Tour does not claim to be a fashionable resort, but it boasts an excellent climate, very good teachers, and moderate living. From £40 to £50 would ensure for a young lady the best boarding in the place, including enough to pay all the school fees.

I have only to add that the expenses of the new building have been almost entirely paid out of the money left to the Church by the late Miss Elizabeth Warne, whose memory will be for ever cherished amongst us.

Passing over less important facts, I come to the work of evangelisation, giving you the comparative statistics of the last two years,—

	1882.	1883.
Regular hearers, . . .	5,214	6,092
Communicants, . . .	3,421	3,616
Received into Communion,	492	541
Catechumens on 30th June,	378	488
Day-school pupils, . .	1,860	1,990
Sunday-school pupils, .	1,973	2,044
Evening-school „ . .	392	63
Contributions, „ . .	fr. 56,516,39	51,462,48

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

These figures show that the work advances steadily, though slowly. True, the contributions show a decrease of 5,053,91 fr., but this is owing to the fact that the Church of Milan last year had made a strenuous effort to complete the new church, and such an effort could not be sustained every year, whilst at Nice the contributions were largely drawn this year to the mission funds on account of the interest created by the near departure of Mr. Weitzacker for South Africa. With these two exceptions the contributions show an increase generally, the central fund having received this year 2876 fr. more than the year before.

The discussion on the subject of evangelisation was very long, and might have been sometimes more to the point. Several of the oldest ministers had presented a series of *desiderata* to be discussed, as to the way in which the work was to be conducted, but I am sorry to say that petty questions, sometimes of a personal character, made us lose a most precious hour. However, much was said that will, I hope, be of use in future, and the men who are at the head of the mission have proved themselves always full of zeal and ability in the discharge of their important functions. I may add here that a petition of twenty members of the Waldensian Congregation of Rome to have back their former minister, received the full consideration of the Synod. After a long discussion, it was remitted to a committee of five, who spent many hours in examining all the documents and in hearing all the persons concerned; then it was discussed again in another sitting; but in the end the Synod did not see their way to alter their decision of last year on the subject.

The number of students in the Theological College of Florence was last year much smaller than usual. This is partly owing to the fact that a preparatory year has been added to the College of La Tour, keeping back a whole class, and partly to the rigour of the military laws, which take away our young men much more than formerly. In spite of that diminution in number the tendency is rather to raise the standard of admission into the school, and to render the studies in the school itself more thorough and complete. The examination of this department of the work gave the greatest satisfaction to the Synod. Our three professors have won the general esteem by their capacity and their zeal. Their works have made them known, not only in Italy, but also abroad. Professor Revel is going to publish for the use of the students a grammar of the Greek Testament, which, added to his excellent Hebrew Grammar and his other works, will give our students a most useful series of manuals for their studies. I may add here that a committee of three has been named to report at next Synod on his translation of the New Testament, with a view of authorising its use in our churches and schools. As the Bible Societies do not circulate Martini's Roman Catholic version, whilst many have been prejudiced against Diodati's, it might be also very useful to have a new version to circulate by means of colportage.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

Let me now mention a most interesting subject that came before the Synod at the end of the Session. Professor Comba and the Rev. Donald Miller of Genoa paid a visit during the summer to the Italian Protestants of Canton Grisons, in Switzerland, whose Church had been founded by Italian reformers of the sixteenth century. I hear that a full relation of their visit is to appear shortly in your columns, therefore I abstain from giving more than the result of it. This was a petition from these old Reformed Churches to the Waldensian Church for a minister to occupy one of their vacant charges, and the Synod has found it right to grant the petition. Most probably the newly-ordained Mr. A. Comba, youngest brother of the professor, will be sent, as he seems the most qualified for such a position. Likewise the Evangelisation Committee of Basle have asked us to give them a minister for their work in Canton Ticino, and Signor P. Colvino will be settled at Biasca. Let no one blame us for scattering our forces; we do so in full obedience to Him who calls, and will not leave us without men for our own work.

Lastly, I will mention the pleasure we had in welcoming several deputations from abroad. It was a great joy to all to see once more their steadfast friends, Rev. Dr. Blaikie and Rev. D. K. Guthrie, of Liberton, who have done so much in raising the new Pastors' Fund. The Rev. William Fraser, of Brighton, came to greet us in the name of the Presbyterians of England. We had likewise deputations from the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of France; but we especially rejoiced in seeing once more amongst us the venerable face of Dr. A. Muston, our old Waldensian historian. What a change of times it showed to hear from his lips the history of his escape into France, more than forty years ago, when he had heard that he was to be arrested for the crime of daring to publish a history of our past persecutions, and to see him now amongst us, not only free, but made a knight of the Crown of Italy for those very historical works for which he was once to be put in prison! His presence was the occasion of a most interesting *séance* of the Historical Waldensian Society, in which many interesting documents were read, and much information given.

I conclude by adding that Dr. Lantaret (who had completed his fortieth year in the administration of the Church) has been re-elected moderator of the Table, and Signor Prochet, president of the Commission of Evangelisation. No changes of importance were made in any of our boards.

A. MEILLE.

P.S.—Allow me a postscript to say with what interest I have read the articles on "Land Tenure in Bible Times" lately published in *The Catholic Presbyterian*. The last one was especially interesting to us because the system therein described, excepting the prohibition of selling the land for ever, is exactly our Waldensian system. I only wish our people could be more persuaded that they hold their lands,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

and all they have, from the Lord, to whom, as their Landlord, they ought to pay due reverence and a larger proportion of their revenue.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE SYNOD.

HAVING been present, along with Rev. D. K. Guthrie, at the Vaudois Synod at La Tour, as a delegate from the Continental Committee of the General Presbyterian Council, and also of the Continental Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, I desire to express the feelings of satisfaction and great enjoyment to which the occasion gave rise. Though the original Vaudois Church consists of but sixteen or seventeen parishes, the Synod, as it sat in the large church of La Tour,—with the members of the Table sitting at one table, the Committee of Evangelisation at another, and the Business Committee and clerks at a third, and with representatives lay and clerical from the ancient parishes, the colleges, and the mission charges in the neighbouring benches,—formed a body both numerous and imposing. It was most interesting to see, side by side with the pastors, representative elders from the various parishes, men whose appearance frequently gave indication of a hard, open-air life, but whose intelligence and seriousness indicated that they were not unworthy to take their place as the advisers and helpers of their Church. In reference to the clerical members, we were struck by the great proportion of able, thoughtful, self-reliant men, and the comparative absence of what, somewhat irreverently, we are accustomed to call "duffers." We could not help thinking that the long training of the Vaudois Church in trial and difficulty must have developed to a remarkable degree the qualities of self-reliance, and taught men everywhere the great lesson of thinking and acting for themselves in times of difficulty and trouble.

Whatever may be said of the want of due superintendence of congregations in other Presbyterian Churches, no such charge could, with any appearance of truth, be made against the Waldenses. Every parish, mission, congregation, or school is inquired into with the greatest minuteness, reports are laid on the table of the Synod, and these are frequently followed up by verbal explanations and discussions. So much inquiry into details is apt to be a little tedious. But the publicity with which everything is discussed at the Synod makes it evident that no hidden plots or secret policy is possible within its borders. It was interesting to compare this open, Presbyterian way of governing the Church with the Episcopal administration of the Church of Rome all round. There was no difficulty in deciding which mode was the more suitable for a free country and a free nation. And one could not help believing that when due weight is given to this state of things, the feeling of the free Italian nation must come to be very decidedly in favour of a government where the voice of the people is heard, and all is done openly and above-board, rather than a policy where one imperial ruler

in each diocese does all, and the one duty of the people is to receive and follow his decisions.

The minuteness with which everything was inquired into, became to strangers, somewhat wearisome, and perhaps the system of inquiry was carried to fully its legitimate length. A little more time, it seemed to us, might have been spent in mutual exhortation and prayer, stirring up both pastors, elders, and people to more consecration of themselves to the Lord, and trying to ascertain how hindrances to the progress of the Lord's work might be removed, and more of the Divine blessing secured, both on the ordinary and the evangelistic operations of the Church.

On the opening day there was a delightful ordination service. The presiding pastor made use, on this occasion, of the liturgy which is allowed to be employed, and is especially adapted to special occasions of the kind. The sermon, on abiding in Christ, was eminently Scriptural and solemn, and when, after kneeling on the floor during prayer, the young men stood up, and one after another, held up their right hand, and to the question whether they accepted their responsibilities, replied with an emphatic "Amen," and then received the laying on of hands, and the kiss of brotherhood, the large assembly was visibly affected, and strangers could not but own the solemnity and pathos of the occasion.

There can be no doubt that the Pastors' Fund of the General Presbyterian Alliance has been a great boon, and has awakened a profound, though not ostentatious gratitude. For ourselves, we could not help going back in thought to a previous occasion in the history of the Vaudois Church. It has happened that two of their greatest benefactors—men to whom they practically owed their resuscitation from a state of outward ruin,—Canon Gilly and General Beckwith, were members of the Church of England. To the latter of these, General Beckwith, it appeared very strongly, and no doubt very conscientiously, that Episcopal government would be a great improvement in the Vaudois Church. Several years ago, he presented an elaborate proposal, that one of their pastors should be loosed from his charge, and made permanent moderator or bishop for the Church. It was not easy to oppose the earnest wish and conscientious conviction of one who had proved himself to be a singularly devoted friend and benefactor. But the pastors were decidedly opposed to the proposal of the General, and the congregations were even more resolute than the pastors. The proposal was respectfully but decidedly declined. They said that their Presbyterian polity had been handed down to them from their fathers, that amid all their persecutions and troubles it had been maintained and had worked well, and that their experience of bishops in the Church of Rome made them very jealous of the whole order. Like the old Scotch minister in the General Assembly in the sixteenth century, when commenting on a proposal for perpetual moderators, they saw "the horns of the mitre" through all the disguise, and they did not like the sight. Among

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

other arguments, the General urged that all the help they had obtained had been from the Church of England, and that the Presbyterians were too much engaged in efforts to pull her down, to take any interest in the Waldenses. When the Synod rejected the proposal of the General, she had no expectation of help from Presbyterian quarters. But it is remarkable that friend after friend was raised up from the Presbyterians. Men like Dr. Stewart, of Leghorn, the late Dr. Guthrie, and the late Dr. W. Robertson became most valuable and devoted friends. And now an alliance of Presbyterian Churches has contributed a sum of £13,446 for the Pastors' Fund. We rejoice that the Waldenses have not been allowed to suffer for their fidelity to Presbyterian polity. At the same time we rejoice, too, that they continue to enjoy some admirable friends in the Church of England. The exertions of the Rev. Mr. Worsfold and others continue to be beyond all praise.

In other and higher points of view, there is little sign of the policy which the Vaudois have maintained turning inefficient. It is one of the distinctions of the Vaudois Church that, through their elders, the people have a prominent share in the government of the Church. Were this to be withdrawn, the whole character of the Church would be materially changed. It is not easy in these days, either in Church or State, to supersede the people. And nowhere in the world, it seems to us, would an aristocratic management of church matters be more out of place than among those poor peasants, who have been so devoted to their Church, and whose forefathers scrupled not to give up home, and farm, and possessions, and life itself, rather than prove unfaithful to Him whom they worshipped as King of kings and Lord of lords. Even as it is, the "Table," or executive commission of the Church, is watched very closely, and its decisions are always liable to be overhauled, and it may be reversed, by the Synod,—the supreme court of the Church.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

Open Council.

DR. MILLIGAN AND CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIANISM.

To the Editor of "The Catholic Presbyterian."

Sir,—Dr. Milligan's letter to you attacks the very existence of all catholic Presbyterianism. Is there such a thing? Can there be such a thing?

It is, I think, fortunate that the question must be deliberately considered this year, in view of the next meeting of the General Council in Belfast. In February last, the *Times*, which usually ignores the Council, gave prominence to the statement by "A Scottish Churchman" that—"Though the secret has never been told, the bulk of the clergy of the Established Church of Scotland at this

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1883.]

moment secretly long for union, on the basis of a modified Episcopacy, with the Church of England." The question is thus raised whether Presbyterianism is a good or a bad thing, and whether it is worth while to preserve it, or whether it may not be better to merge it in a moderate Episcopacy.

I do not mean to ask permission to discuss this question now; not that it is a day too soon to begin. On the contrary, it is because the question is so important, so central, and so pressing—because it looms so near and looms so large—that I ask permission to point out in advance that it divides itself into two parts.

One side concerns Scotland alone.

Dr. Milligan's statement, "The cry, 'Scotland for the Presbyterians,' is to my mind one without a principle to rest upon," and his proposal to unite with Scotch Episcopacy rather than with Catholic Presbytery, cuts at the roots of our national life. Has our history been without a principle? Has Scottish Presbyterianism, established or disestablished (and I agree with him as to the comparative insignificance of that question) come now to be so far without historical principle that it ought to be abandoned? Will Dr. Milligan and his friends not even make an *effort* to keep it up? Dr. Milligan says he cannot ask a Scottish Episcopal laird to leave Episcopacy and join the Scottish people,—it would be "unpardonable presumption" to do so. In this he goes further even than the "Scottish Churchman," who in February urged that the "Tory lairds" must, in their own interest, give more than a nominal support to the Church of Scotland. The true support would be that they should join the mass of the Scottish people as candid but moderate Presbyterians. But if there is "no principle" to urge upon them, if ours is not the natural and the catholic form of Church life, why should they do so? Why not pull down our blue flag altogether?

But this shows that there is another side of the question—one which concerns the General Council and the whole world.

This, too, has been raised, I for one think quite fairly and legitimately, both in the Assembly and by its ex-moderator. If there is "no principle" pleadable for Presbyterianism in Scotland, there is certainly less anywhere else. There is less in Ireland. There is less in America. There is less in Australia. If Presbyterianism, even in Scotland, has a past but no future, you cannot ask people to cast in their future along with it anywhere. Above all, if there is no catholicity in Presbyterianism,—if it is not the form which can invite and embrace other less manly and less complete forms of worship to merge themselves in it, then the less we have to do with it the better. But is this so? Is what Dr. Milligan calls "the Presbyterian spirit" necessarily a narrow one? Is the Council, which represents it in its world-wide variety, necessarily narrow? Are we to abandon Presbyterianism in Scotland, in order to abandon catholic Presbyterianism over the world?

We have eight months before us in which to decide the question.—I am, &c.,

A LAYMAN.

STIRLING, 5th September, 1883.

"PROCEEDINGS OF FIRST GENERAL PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL."

The remaining copies of this volume, published at Six Shillings, may be had at Half-price. Any one transmitting Three Shillings to Mr. JOHN MOLYNEUX, 13 SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET, EDINBURGH, will receive a copy, post free. It gives a complete history of the movement; the constitution of the Alliance as settled in 1875; the papers that were read at the Edinburgh meeting; the speeches and discussions connected with them; also a very copious Appendix, containing an account of the Presbyterian Churches throughout the world, their history and present condition, and various other documents deeply interesting to Presbyterian readers.